

WYOMING.

Charles T. Sherbno to be postmaster at Sunrise, Wyo. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 12, 1915.

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY.

William H. Hornibrook to be envoy. extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Siam.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

M. W. Camper, Florence.

MARYLAND.

Alice L. Exley, Kensington.
William J. Ford, Lonaconing.
David H. Hastings, Lutherville.
Samuel A. Wyvill, Upper Marlboro.

NORTH DAKOTA.

George W. Wilkinson, Fargo.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

James A. Clardy, Laurens.
John W. Geraty, Yorges Island.
Bernard B. James, Union.

TENNESSEE.

Fred P. Darwin, Dayton.
Joseph W. Nichols, Trenton.
George W. Phebus, jr., Union City.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, February 12, 1915.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou great Spirit, Father of all souls, the inspiration of every great thought, earnest conviction, and worthy endeavor, we are reminded to-day of a great soul whom Thou didst call to bear the burdens of the Nation in the hour of its greatest peril; who listened, heard, obeyed, and left in his wake a character so pure, so noble, so true, so brave. His deeds live and will live so long as men cherish life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It is well for us to perpetuate his memory in bronze and granite, but let us hold his memory sacred to our hearts, live the principles he enunciated, follow his illustrious example, and be willing, faithful servants in the tasks Thou hast set for us, "that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth." And Thine be the praise forever in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Missouri rise?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, this is the anniversary of the birthday of Abraham Lincoln. I ask unanimous consent to have read at the Clerk's desk his now renowned address delivered at Gettysburg in 1863.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to have read from the Clerk's desk the Gettysburg address of Abraham Lincoln. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] to read it.

Mr. RUSSELL, from the Clerk's desk, read Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, delivered at the dedication of the cemetery at Gettysburg, November 19, 1863, as follows:

"Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new Nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

"Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that Nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battle field of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives that that Nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

"But, in a larger sense, we can not dedicate, we can not consecrate, we can not hallow this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here have consecrated it far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note nor

long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth."

[Prolonged applause.]

The SPEAKER. Under a special order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULDEN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Speaker, last year on this day it was my privilege to make a few brief remarks regarding Lincoln's famous speech at Gettysburg. On the occasion when it was delivered, the dedication of the battle field as a national cemetery, it was my good fortune to be present and hear the address from its author's lips. I remember the impressive ceremonies of that solemn day and the long and eloquent tribute of Edward Everett, which has been forgotten.

Many times since that memorable day I have been asked regarding President Lincoln's appearance and manner, how he contrasted with the others present, how his speech seemed to impress his hearers, and the difference in effect between the President's speech and that of Mr. Everett.

The day was so impressive in itself and after events so fixed it in my mind that its central facts are still as clear and vivid as though it were yesterday. When the President came forward, after the finished oration of Mr. Everett, he looked tired and seemed nervous. Hearty applause greeted him as he stepped to the front of the platform.

With his right arm extended and with a smile that illumined his rugged face, giving it a charm that only those who actually saw it could understand or appreciate, he began his speech in clear distinct tones that carried to quite a distance. At first his voice trembled slightly, but speedily recovered, and amid a profound silence his audience heard the words that were uttered by President Lincoln.

It seemed that he had but started speaking when, with both arms extended as if in benediction, he finished and retired without a change in his solemn countenance. No one realized that he had finished, evidently expecting a much longer effort; and the awe-struck people, apparently deeply moved, gave no sign of approval or appreciation. That was the way it appealed to those around me and to myself.

The profound silence which attended the speech continued; not a sound was heard for a minute or two; then everyone began turning to his neighbors, looking into their faces, and making such comments as "Did he finish?" "Was it not a grand speech, but so short!"

Though Everett, Seward, and others on the platform shook Mr. Lincoln's hand, he quickly took his seat, evidently sorely disappointed that the people had given no sign of any kind as to the effect of the speech.

It was my good fortune to see the President again on several occasions, notably at City Point early in 1865, where he had gone to be in close touch with the Army leaders, then relentlessly closing in on Lee. The soldiers and sailors of the Army and Navy who were at City Point in large numbers idolized the President, and warmly and affectionately greeted him wherever he appeared. He was their hero.

On July 11, 1864, at Fort Stevens, in the District of Columbia, our improvised forces, many drawn from the clerks in the departments and the workingmen from the navy yard, had been hastily assembled to repel Early's threatened attack on Washington. President Lincoln was under fire from the enemy's guns on that day. He exposed himself by standing on the earthworks of the fort to study the field in front of our line, notwithstanding the earnest protests of Gen. McCook, the commanding officer. He slowly descended from his dangerous position the coolest of anyone in the fort. Being in the service at the time with a battery at the Shoemaker place, quite near Fort Stevens, I saw President Lincoln enter and leave our front, and while not an eyewitness to the scene, I had it direct from several who had seen the incident, and therefore I have no doubt of its being true.

Alexander H. Coffroth, of Somerset County, Pa., a Member of this House in the Thirty-eighth and Thirty-ninth Congresses, although a Democrat in politics, was one of Mr. Lincoln's warm personal friends and, like him, a capital story teller. Through mutual friends, although I was but a youngster, I grew to know Mr. Coffroth quite well, and from his lips heard many character-

istic stories of the President's big heartedness and of his humane actions.

One was that on going to the White House one day he saw two poorly dressed women, each with a baby in her arms, sitting near by and crying. Mr. Coffroth stopped and soon learned their sad plight. They were the wives of coal miners in Pennsylvania, and their husbands, recently arrived from abroad, had been drafted and sent to Washington for service in the Army of the Potomac.

The Congressman bade them wait until he returned. He at once talked to Mr. Lincoln about them, telling the whole story. The latter sent for the women, and after listening to them gave an order for the discharge of the husbands, giving it to an orderly, who, under the President's instructions, saw it carried out; and the reunited families returned home the same day.

The widow of the brave and heroic Gen. Pickett, who led the famous charge at Gettysburg on July 3, 1863, told me personally quite recently of the visit of President Lincoln to her home in Richmond the day following the evacuation of the Confederate capital, and of his great kindness. It was through Mr. Lincoln that Gen. Pickett was sent to West Point and given a place in Washington soon after the war closed.

These personal touches and impressions have endeared to me the memory of the martyred President; but I have always had a profound respect and admiration for many other things in his life and character which seemed to bind all to him personally. He was a wonderful combination of sadness and cheerfulness, of strong, steady character and moods of frivolity, and was a constant fascination and puzzle even to his intimates.

I believe this combination of sadness and cheerfulness was a natural balancing of his character, and to accentuate either one or the other is to distort the picture; to lay too much stress on Lincoln the story teller is to forget the great statesman; he relieved the profound weight of great responsibility by the delight he took in a good story, and by the clever way he used it to "point a moral" or drive home a needed lesson.

In discussing his story-telling habit with the late Senator Chauncey M. Depew he said that the common people, whom he knew and understood, were more easily influenced and informed through a broad illustration than in any other way, and he did not care what the hypercritical few thought. He also said that he had invented but two stories in his life, but that he could tell tolerably well the stories of other people.

His taste in verse ran usually in the opposite course, and he loved to recite and to sing sad and sentimental poems and patriotic songs. Among his favorites were Byron's *Dream*; Ben Bolt; *Lament of the Irish Emigrant*; *I've Wandered to the Village, Tom*; and *Sword of Bunker Hill*. He was even known on one or two occasions to compose a few verses himself, usually upon some sad occasion, such as the death of a boyhood friend. On the afternoon of the day Lee surrendered, while the President's boat was steaming up the Potomac, one of the passages from Shakespeare which he read aloud to his companions was that from *Macbeth*, following the death of Duncan.

But the poem which he oftenest recited and which seems to have been his greatest favorite and had become immortalized as such was the very long one by William Knox, beginning:

Oh! why should the spirit of mortal be proud?
Like a swift-fleeting meteor, a fast-flying cloud,
A flash of the lightning, a break of the wave,
He passeth from life to his rest in the grave.

The leaves of the oak and the willow shall fade,
Be scattered around, and together be laid;
And the young and the old, and the low and the high,
Shall moulder to dust, and together shall lie.

Years later I heard some lines which I believe Mr. Lincoln would have keenly appreciated, but which he never seems to have known. They are so appropriate to the man, so much of an epitome of his life and spirit, that I can not do better than quote them as a fitting close to this brief account of my personal recollections of the great man as well as for your thought:

Fathers, have ye bled in vain,
Ages, must ye droop again,
Maker, shall we rashly stain,
Blessings sent by Thee?

No! receive our solemn vow,
As before Thy throne we bow
Ever to maintain as now,
Union! Liberty!

[Applause.]

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for eight minutes to talk on Abraham Lincoln.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for 10 minutes to talk on Abraham Lincoln. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, we all concede that nothing new can be said of Abraham Lincoln—neither as a man nor as a President. History and biography have been busy with his name and fame for more than half a century, and history has said its last word. It was that crash of cannon shot against the walls of Fort Sumter which started the movement that made the name of Abraham Lincoln the most sacred heritage of a redeemed Nation. Without the titanic conflict that followed the name and fame of Abraham Lincoln might never have inspired a national lyric.

It is not great men who make great epochs of history. It is great epochs that make great men. Had there been no Trojan war there would have been no Homer. Had there been no conflict of the kings in the formative period of English literature there would have been no Shakespeare. Had there been no war of the American Revolution there would have been no George Washington, and had there been no Civil War in 1861 there would have been no Abraham Lincoln.

The American people were leading a dull and melancholy life before that awful struggle of arms, but with that crash of cannon shot against the walls of Sumter came a new and inspired life. When the storm burst the finger of God dropped the plummet into the dead sea, and with the overflow came new hopes, new ambitions, and new inspirations. And throughout that four years' struggle, the most desperate and long continued of modern wars, the leading hand, the guiding spirit in the camps and courts and capitals of the Nation was Abraham Lincoln, the President and Commander in Chief.

On election day in November, 1864, I was with a veteran army, marching to battle; to the desperate death grapple at Franklin, Tenn. That morning early, before the start, I rode back to the ambulance corps and obtained an ambulance, and at every halt in that dreary November day of forced marching the soldiers of my regiment voted in an old camp kettle for President; and we counted the votes at night by the dim light of the bivouac fires—only seven votes against Abraham Lincoln in the whole regiment.

Only once did I ever meet Abraham Lincoln. That was on the 4th day of March, 1865, when I was clothed in the grim harness of war, with my once blue uniform tarnished in grime from the red clay roads of northern Georgia. Then I stood within 10 feet of him on the east front of the Capitol and heard him deliver his last inaugural—his last oration on earth. I heard him say:

Fondly do we hope, fervently do we pray, that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan.

We have made a half century of history since that eventful day, but I can see Lincoln now as I saw him then—a tall, gaunt, stalwart man, with deep lines of care furrowing his cheeks, with inexpressible sadness in his face, the face of a man of many sorrows. A sad face, a strong face, a face radiant with the inspiration of a great soul, as he voiced in prophecy the ultimate destiny of this Nation. As a soldier of the Republic I heard Abraham Lincoln voice his national ideals in his last message to the American people.

Two million soldiers fought under Abraham Lincoln, the revered President and Commander in Chief, in the most desperate and longest enduring war of modern times. Over and above the 2,000,000 soldier graves that are, or soon will be, there rises triumphant in the radiant glory of a world-wide beneficence the prescient prophet of emancipation, the leader in the grandest epoch-making era of all civilization—Abraham Lincoln. [Loud applause.]

PENSIONS.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, to-day, under the rules of the House, is set apart for the consideration of pension bills on the Private Calendar. There are no House bills upon the calendar, but there are three bills from the Senate upon that calendar. There is pending at this time and being considered in the House an important appropriation bill with which the chairman of that committee desires to proceed. Desiring to accommodate ourselves to the Appropriations Committee and the other leaders of the House, our committee desires to yield to-day, with the understanding that the committee will be recognized next Monday, in order to pass these bills under suspension of the rules.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be recognized for the purpose of asking unanimous consent that a special report of the Interior Department upon the bill pending before the Indian Committee of the House relative to the Seneca Indians in New York—

The SPEAKER. Well, we will attend to this other matter first. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Missouri, to suspend the rules, and pass these pension bills.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will there be any trouble about these bills?

Mr. MANN. Let us see if there will be any opposition.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, so as to find out, that these pension bills may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union now.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman can withdraw the request if there is opposition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that these Senate pension bills be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the Clerk will report the first bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 6980) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The bill was read.

During the reading of the bill,

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Catharine Terwilger, widow of John W. Terwilger, late of Company F, One hundred and fifty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. PLATT. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if this Catharine Terwilger bill is the one introduced by Senator Root. If it is, she is dead.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is it one introduced by Senator Root?

Mr. PLATT. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know. There is nothing in the report to show who introduced the bill originally. If the gentleman knows she is dead I will be glad to have him suggest an amendment.

Mr. PLATT. It will not do any harm, but I think the woman is dead. It is a bill of mine which I got Senator Root to introduce.

The following committee amendments were read:

Page 3, strike out lines 5 to 8, inclusive. (Herman Sebort.)

Page 4, strike out lines 22 to 25, inclusive. (Mary J. Gooding.)

Page 6, line 1, strike out "\$40" and insert in lieu thereof "\$36." (William Rodgers.)

Page 7, strike out lines 15 to 20, inclusive. (Elizabeth J. Mullin.)

Page 8, line 22, strike out "\$20" and insert "\$12." (Phyllama B. Mahoney.)

Page 9, line 2, strike out "\$20" and insert "\$12." (Justine M. Thrift.)

Page 9, line 19, strike out "\$24" and insert "\$20." (Julia Sitz.)

Page 15, strike out lines 20 to 23, inclusive. (John S. Perriton.)

Page 18, strike out lines 13 to 18, inclusive. (Ella M. Decker.)

Page 19, line 8, strike out "\$20" and insert "\$24." (Emily S. Keller.)

Page 24, line 1, strike out "\$30" and insert "\$20." (Hannah C. Van Tassel.)

Page 24, line 21, strike out "\$50" and insert "\$40." (George W. Brewer.)

Page 25, strike out lines 15 to 18, inclusive. (George A. Bloese.)

The foregoing bill is a substitute for the following Senate bills referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

S. 337. James A. Fancher.
S. 369. Katie A. Beardsley.
S. 722. Mary Lotty.
S. 811. Andrew A. Kelley.
S. 969. James H. Meekin.
S. 974. Thomas H. Kennedy.
S. 1015. James Edwards.
S. 1096. Amanda Parmalee.
S. 1319. Herman Sebort.
S. 1392. Franklin Comstock.
S. 1795. Jonathan S. Nickerson.
S. 2010. Charles H. Eding.
S. 2038. Augustus M. Barnes.
S. 2127. James W. Magers.
S. 2180. George W. Smith.
S. 2324. Martha J. Whiting.
S. 2377. Joseph R. C. Hunter.
S. 2896. Grace E. McDonald.
S. 3011. Mary J. Gooding.
S. 3040. George T. Smith.
S. 3388. Anna F. Quinn.
S. 3504. James H. Nale.
S. 3613. Hattie A. Harris (formerly Hungerford).
S. 4024. Harlan Gause.
S. 4090. William Rodgers.
S. 4099. Frank A. Olney.
S. 4119. Nelson W. Armstrong.
S. 4401. Jeremiah Lyshon.
S. 4478. Ormiston C. Wing.
S. 4597. M. Theresa Sampson.
S. 4599. Almond R. Spaulding.
S. 4692. Alfred Deforest Walker.
S. 4763. John R. Boso.
S. 4766. Lucinda E. Nelson.
S. 4856. Elizabeth J. Mullin.
S. 4859. Sarah E. Badley.
S. 5054. Hugh K. Godding.
S. 5056. Thomas Dial.
S. 5185. Joseph M. Lansden.
S. 5190. Joseph M. Conway.
S. 5196. Phyllama B. Mahoney.
S. 5218. Justine M. Thrift.
S. 5266. Caspar Schiesser.
S. 5333. Moses Bahney.
S. 5335. Peter Smith.
S. 5372. Julian Sitz.
S. 5379. Amanda M. Startzman.
S. 5440. Emily Morang.
S. 5453. Marcus E. Ferguson.
S. 5595. William Hurley.
S. 5638. Whitman M. Colby.
S. 5725. Anna M. Foster.
S. 5740. Jacob C. Rennaker.
S. 5765. Minerva Freeman.
S. 5766. Cornelia A. Anderson.
S. 5767. Margaret A. Bitgood.
S. 5768. Almira E. Briggs.
S. 5775. Maria Lewis.
S. 5793. Elisha W. Ellis.
S. 5795. Elizabeth Pangburn.
S. 5797. Mary M. Calef.
S. 5799. John A. Patterson.
S. 5807. Annie Wilson.
S. 5821. Benjamin F. Bourne.
S. 5822. Robert S. Clark.
S. 5828. Lucy Carey.
S. 5831. Frances Terry.
S. 5850. Mary A. De Lany.
S. 5852. Charles Nettleton.
S. 5863. Orville Choate.
S. 5867. Frederick W. Schaeffer.
S. 5868. Catharine Terwilger.
S. 5878. Stephen D. Mitchell.
S. 5889. Benjamin Williams.
S. 5895. Ezra W. Conant.

S. 5900. Laura C. Bailey.
S. 5901. David Frank.
S. 5961. Harriet J. Weddle.
S. 5964. Amanda F. Powell.
S. 5965. King R. Olmstead.
S. 5976. John S. Perriton.
S. 5983. Samuel L. Cole.
S. 5991. Egbert W. Reed.
S. 8001. James S. Crockett.
S. 8006. Mary J. Sanders.
S. 8010. Charles A. Dick.
S. 8013. Fenton Butterfield.
S. 8014. Margaret Sheridan.
S. 8017. Elizabeth Buckless.
S. 8018. Martha V. Coleman.
S. 8023. Emma S. Rowe.
S. 8038. Martha J. Bretney.
S. 8044. Peter M. Fritts.
S. 8049. Calvin Barker.
S. 8065. John G. Berry.
S. 8071. Oscar Avery.
S. 8079. Ella M. Decker.
S. 8081. William P. Stone.
S. 8086. Mary Alfrey.
S. 8096. Mary M. Nolan.
S. 8123. Emily S. Keller.
S. 8124. Georgia Ann Taylor.
S. 8135. Jean H. G. Kitchel.
S. 8139. Samuel R. Littrell.
S. 8145. Charles T. Blumenrother.
S. 8149. Jerome B. Wood.
S. 8150. Charles H. McCarty.
S. 8156. George D. Carter.
S. 8161. Hiram Bender.
S. 8164. Juliette Pierce.
S. 8174. Frank Pugsley.
S. 8180. Callie E. Kookan.
S. 8181. Seraphina Kain.
S. 8182. Ellen Milam.
S. 8193. Elmira Swan.
S. 8212. Harriet L. Willis.
S. 8213. Clara R. Squier.
S. 8223. John S. Colbath.
S. 8257. Jane Letcher.
S. 8260. Lovina J. Nudd.
S. 8273. Rufus N. Brown.
S. 8276. Sara J. Titsworth.
S. 8310. May C. Moore.
S. 8312. Horace L. Farmer.
S. 8338. Sarah E. Stoddard.
S. 8351. George H. Lewis.
S. 8353. Albert F. Wright.

S. 6356. David M. Hilton.
S. 6359. Hannah C. Van Tassel.
S. 6360. Samuel Brenner.
S. 6370. Edward E. Teter.
S. 6379. Joseph McKinsey.
S. 6393. William H. Miller.
S. 6394. George W. Brewer.
S. 6409. George W. Crouso.
S. 6421. Gertrude Cornwell.
S. 6422. Eden N. Leavens.
S. 6426. Murray V. Livingston.
S. 6432. George A. Bloese.
S. 6434. Joel A. Ginter.
S. 6444. Hiram E. Tinker.
S. 6446. John C. Leith.
S. 6452. Lydia Irene Cheney.
S. 6464. Louisa Schenk.
S. 6465. William H. Howell.
S. 6481. Emily L. Small.
S. 6482. Isaiah Davis.
S. 6483. Thomas H. Core.
S. 6498. Samuel Coleman.
S. 6529. Charles M. Milligan.
S. 6534. John W. Grubb.
S. 6545. James W. Sargent.
S. 6606. Sarah B. Hamer.
S. 6607. Eliza J. Riggs.
S. 6608. Louisa C. Pangburn.
S. 6610. John W. Gaddis.
S. 6625. Caroline Dufner.
S. 6630. Smith C. Hotchklin.
S. 6640. Charles Pettys.
S. 6651. Margaret Williams.
S. 6652. Murranda Martin.
S. 6664. Thomas Winegardner.
S. 6666. Charles L. Stuck.
S. 6669. Annie E. Yelton.
S. 6696. Amanda E. Bateman.
S. 6698. Ammazetta L. Nettleton.
S. 6701. Byron C. Davis.
S. 6705. Andrew J. Hall.
S. 6707. Gordon H. Shepard.
S. 6715. Charles Wickliffe.
S. 6788. Hugh Smith.
S. 6789. John C. Wilson.
S. 6793. Maggie S. Northway.
S. 6795. William H. D. Lancaster.
S. 6796. Jay D. Morse.
S. 6798. John Nelson.
S. 6831. Perry G. Glines.
S. 6855. Charles H. Flournoy.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to. The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

SENECA AND OTHER INDIANS OF THE FIVE NATIONS, NEW YORK (H. DOC. NO. 1590).

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to renew my request for unanimous consent.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, there are two other bills.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that; but the gentleman from Texas has something he wants to get done by unanimous consent.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I ask unanimous consent to have a report from the Department of the Interior, and also one from the Department of Justice, on a bill to settle the affairs of the Seneca and other Indians in the Five Nations, of New York, printed as a House document.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] asks unanimous consent to have printed as a House document certain Senate and House reports on the Seneca Indians. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. These reports are made to whom?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. These reports are made to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It is apparent that they can not be taken up at this session, but they are very fine reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PENSIONS.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one of these Senate pension bills.

The Clerk read the following bill:

A bill (S. 7213) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill, with the following committee amendments, which were agreed to:

On page 1, strike out lines 6 to 9, inclusive.
On page 3, strike out lines 1 to 4, inclusive.
On page 3, strike out lines 5 to 8, inclusive.
On page 4, strike out lines 15 to 18, inclusive.
On page 5, strike out lines 15 to 18, inclusive.
On page 9, strike out lines 3 to 5, inclusive.
On page 11, line 21, strike out "\$30" and insert in lieu thereof "\$24."

Mr. DIES rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas rise?

Mr. DIES. I rise for the purpose of striking out a word or two, with a view to getting information on the bill or making a pro forma amendment for the purpose of asking the gentleman in charge of the bill a question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. DIES. I wanted to ask the chairman of the Committee on Pensions if it is to be the policy of that committee to continue bringing in these private pension bills in the event of an extra session? That is to say, if we have an extra session, are we to have a continuation of the private pension bills?

Mr. SHERWOOD. In answer to the gentleman's question, Mr. Speaker, I will say that it would depend upon the action of the committee. We did not do it at the last extra session. I may say, on the part of the chairman, that it is not the intention to bring in private pension bills in case there should be an extra session.

Mr. DIES. The gentleman understands that the majority of the House is strongly opposed to an extra session, and that may have an influence on the disposition of the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted, I do not think any pension bills have been brought in at an extra session. That has been the policy at extra sessions.

Mr. DIES. I just wanted to get that information.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read the remainder of the bill, with the following committee amendments, which were agreed to:

- On page 13, strike out lines 11 to 14, inclusive.
- On page 14, strike out lines 1 to 4, inclusive.
- On page 17, strike out lines 20 to 23, inclusive.
- On page 19, line 15, strike out "\$40" and insert in lieu thereof "\$36."
- On page 24, line 14, strike out "\$36" and insert in lieu thereof "\$30."
- On page 25, line 15, strike out "\$20" and insert in lieu thereof "\$24."
- On page 26, line 9, strike out "\$30" and insert in lieu thereof "\$40."
- On page 27, strike out lines 7 to 10, inclusive.

The foregoing bill is a substitute for the following Senate bills referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

- S. 794. Frederika B. Trillee.
- S. 2120. George F. Brown.
- S. 2146. John Bachtler.
- S. 2362. George D. Stebbins.
- S. 2524. Isabell C. Dean.
- S. 2790. Nancy J. Northrup.
- S. 2868. Lucy P. Wheeler.
- S. 2874. Catherine Kelly.
- S. 2892. William C. Hinson.
- S. 3141. Julia C. Nickerson.
- S. 3144. Frances E. Berry.
- S. 3445. Mary Parsons.
- S. 3459. Watie H. Stodder.
- S. 3541. Alfred Dearmy.
- S. 3570. Clarkson D. Ayers.
- S. 3788. Jane Hubbard.
- S. 4112. James T. Kent.
- S. 4114. David R. Forsha.
- S. 4341. Jesse Monticue.
- S. 4581. Elizabeth Martin.
- S. 4785. James H. Givens.
- S. 4877. Egbert Dart.
- S. 4985. Larkin Russell.
- S. 5240. Anthony Krass.
- S. 5246. Henry Miller.
- S. 5271. James W. Lansberry.
- S. 5367. John H. Condon.
- S. 5369. George D. Hamm.
- S. 5384. Wealthy L. Kelsey.
- S. 5563. Henry C. Jacks.
- S. 5567. Harrison Welch.
- S. 5642. Martha Lance.
- S. 5769. Mary Jane Campbell.
- S. 5770. Henry S. Gay.
- S. 5772. Agnes M. Heck.
- S. 5773. Louise M. Hunle.
- S. 5774. Maria B. Hyde.
- S. 5776. Johanna Mansfield.
- S. 5778. Isabella Neff.
- S. 5780. Francis Robinson.
- S. 5800. George W. Harding.
- S. 5818. William H. Hayes.
- S. 5820. Robert G. Calhoun.
- S. 5829. Albert A. Lance.
- S. 5857. Maria E. Pitts.
- S. 5891. Clara B. Randall.
- S. 5926. Eugene Lenhart.
- S. 5944. William D. Boyd.
- S. 5992. Ann Simons.
- S. 6009. George Warner.
- S. 6026. Mary A. Selleck.
- S. 6045. Adam F. Wilson.
- S. 6063. David L. Cross.
- S. 6068. Anna B. Fay.
- S. 6087. Roswell Savers.
- S. 6091. Joseph L. Williams.
- S. 6105. John T. Allen.
- S. 6153. William Lockwood.
- S. 6154. James S. Wintemute.
- S. 6157. William Roseberry.
- S. 6159. Albert W. Dyer.
- S. 6166. John Gossage.
- S. 6183. William Crouch.
- S. 6189. Thomas Jefferson Stafford.
- S. 6208. Benjamin McClelan.
- S. 6215. David W. Mead.
- S. 6222. Hymellus Mendenhall.
- S. 6233. John Deering, Jr.
- S. 6237. Francis C. Wood.
- S. 6239. Augusta A. Crommett.
- S. 6240. Ella V. Jones.
- S. 6258. Charles E. Ewing.
- S. 6259. James M. Barnett.
- S. 6274. Esli A. Bowen.
- S. 6335. John F. Grayum.
- S. 6336. Joseph L. Hays.
- S. 6337. Sarah E. Squires.
- S. 6350. Elizabeth Scott.
- S. 6352. James M. Tackett.
- S. 6354. Hester Morse.
- S. 6358. Mary T. Ryan.
- S. 6371. Lewis Walker.
- S. 6380. John W. Covey.
- S. 6387. William W. Graham.
- S. 6388. Sylvester Chaplin.
- S. 6391. Amy D. Wetherell.
- S. 6416. Henry Quint.
- S. 6417. Sanford B. Sylvester.
- S. 6459. Sarah M. Hicks.
- S. 6473. Jacob Jones.
- S. 6479. Jonathan Thuma.
- S. 6488. John M. Miller.
- S. 6494. James F. Brown.
- S. 6499. Henry Miller.
- S. 6500. William H. Fountain.
- S. 6501. Albert E. Magoffin.
- S. 6509. John M. Herder.
- S. 6522. Carrie M. Case.
- S. 6524. Amanda Baxter.
- S. 6539. Cora H. Alward.
- S. 6541. Alfred J. Adair.
- S. 6542. William Porter.
- S. 6543. Henry Clay.
- S. 6546. Hannah M. Bates.
- S. 6550. Joseph N. Stockford.
- S. 6561. Salome Nothhardt.
- S. 6600. Jefferson Wood.
- S. 6601. Eli C. Walton.
- S. 6614. Phillip Crowl.
- S. 6615. Nathaniel Trueblood.
- S. 6642. Anna Mary McOmber.
- S. 6645. Charles H. Morrison.
- S. 6661. Henry Roth.
- S. 6665. John C. Hamilton.
- S. 6676. John Sigman.
- S. 6693. Helen A. Underhill.
- S. 6695. Susan E. Hoidt.
- S. 6711. Robert S. Thomas.

- S. 6785. Wyatt C. Crawford.
- S. 6792. Julia M. Sayles.
- S. 6794. Nicholas Metzger.
- S. 6797. Gertrude Edmonds.
- S. 6799. John T. Hayes.
- S. 6800. William Franklin Stotts.
- S. 6804. Mary J. Wilcox.
- S. 6808. George Turnbaugh.
- S. 6825. Isaac Baker.
- S. 6826. John Ryan.
- S. 6830. Jasper McPhall.
- S. 6833. Louisa Bendel.
- S. 6834. Stephen K. Ashley.
- S. 6836. Samuel McClure.
- S. 6840. Earl W. Soper.
- S. 6841. Charles Fredrick.
- S. 6847. John E. Saunders.
- S. 6850. Nancy I. Williams.
- S. 6852. James O. Anderson.
- S. 6860. Edward Pilot.
- S. 6867. James K. Deyo.
- S. 6870. Susan E. Manning.

- S. 6874. Juriah Cline.
- S. 6879. Annette M. Lamoreaux.
- S. 6880. Esen Z. Guild.
- S. 6884. Emanuel Klepper.
- S. 6885. Hiram W. Babcock.
- S. 6886. George W. Carpenter.
- S. 6897. Rose Anna Nagley.
- S. 6914. Robert Jenkins.
- S. 6926. Charles P. Harmon.
- S. 6928. James Inman.
- S. 6930. John H. Masterson.
- S. 6931. William Carter.
- S. 6932. Maria T. Jones.
- S. 6953. Joseph S. Herndon.
- S. 6955. Ellen M. Bellows.
- S. 6956. Victoria S. Day.
- S. 6959. Lucy W. Osborne.
- S. 6961. Theodore M. Burge.
- S. 6984. Edwin Rudrauff.
- S. 7054. Eliza M. Doran.
- S. 7055. Louisa Walters.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill as amended.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. The next bill is S. 7402.

The Clerk read the bill (S. 7402), granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The following committee amendments were read, considered, and agreed to:

- Page 2, strike out lines 3 to 6, inclusive.
- Page 2, strike out lines 23 and 24, and on page 3 strike out lines 1 and 2.
- Page 3, strike out lines 15 to 18, inclusive.
- Page 4, strike out lines 3 to 6, inclusive.
- Page 4, in line 10, strike out "\$30" and insert "\$24."
- Page 4, line 14, strike out "\$20" and insert "\$12."
- Page 4, strike out lines 20 to 23, inclusive.
- Page 5, line 6, strike out "\$25" and insert "\$20."
- Page 5, strike out lines 16 to 19, inclusive.
- Page 5, strike out lines 24 and 25, and on page 6, strike out lines 1 and 2.
- Page 8, strike out lines 9 to 12, inclusive.
- Page 11, in line 13, strike out "\$50" and insert "\$40."
- Page 11, line 21, strike out "\$20" and insert "\$24."
- Page 12, line 5, strike out "\$50" and insert "\$36."
- Page 15, strike out lines 11 to 14, inclusive.
- Page 19, strike out lines 3 to 6, inclusive.

The foregoing bill is a substitute for the following Senate bills referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

- S. 354. Edwin B. Wright.
- S. 940. Mary W. Gross.
- S. 1019. Delia E. Godfrey.
- S. 1265. Thomas Buckley.
- S. 1782. Samuel G. H. Whitley.
- S. 2000. Joseph Johnson.
- S. 2037. Marcus W. Bates.
- S. 2267. Otto Kuehn.
- S. 2363. Sarah H. Aldis.
- S. 2869. Sarah E. Arnold.
- S. 3186. Laura F. Lawton.
- S. 3498. Daniel Hilliard.
- S. 3750. Lovina J. Reeves.
- S. 4013. Charles F. White.
- S. 4050. Rose V. Stoops.
- S. 4427. Julia F. Brewerton.
- S. 4480. Mary Carpenter.
- S. 4615. Isaac Nebbunburgh.
- S. 4790. James Forsyth Harrison.
- S. 5132. Benjamin Clark.
- S. 5400. Jane E. Myers.
- S. 5457. Vesta V. Holden.
- S. 5514. Loucette E. Glavis.
- S. 5518. John F. Miller.
- S. 5590. Mary Healy.
- S. 5599. Clara G. Branch.
- S. 5672. Harriet M. Marks.
- S. 5694. George M. Getts.
- S. 5746. Horace Page.
- S. 5777. Jessie A. Maxson.
- S. 5781. Elizabeth C. Service.
- S. 5782. James Tucker.
- S. 5783. Ellen Twomey.
- S. 5784. Julia F. Whipple.
- S. 5785. Emily J. Williams.
- S. 5856. John W. Sullivan.
- S. 5879. Paul Phillips, alias Duncan Dunbar.
- S. 5898. Susan J. Flye.
- S. 6003. William Henry Scule.
- S. 6035. Mary L. De Mars.
- S. 6088. Margaretta B. Benjamin.
- S. 6104. Frances A. Rogers.
- S. 6196. Cynthia Buel.
- S. 6197. Cornelia S. Hitchcock.
- S. 6209. James M. Watkins.
- S. 6220. George M. Taylor.
- S. 6221. Buriil Caton.
- S. 6226. William Hanoch.
- S. 6243. Nelson E. Haskell.
- S. 6307. George W. Bosal.
- S. 6377. Eli Reese.
- S. 6378. John H. Tyson.
- S. 6383. William T. Davidson.
- S. 6390. John B. Doolittle.
- S. 6407. Henry G. Dearmond.
- S. 6408. Thomas Johnson.
- S. 6410. Elizabeth Reed.
- S. 6469. Katie M. Penfield.
- S. 6508. Robert J. Martin.
- S. 6517. Daniel W. Smith.
- S. 6518. Charlotte A. Crowell.
- S. 6527. Joseph P. Kridelbaugh.
- S. 6531. Charles H. Lewis.
- S. 6533. Frederick Hutton.
- S. 6557. Sarah J. Crackel.
- S. 6562. Jennie Jones.
- S. 6591. Charlotte S. Manley.
- S. 6605. George W. Read.
- S. 6617. John H. Beatty.
- S. 6626. William Braginton.
- S. 6629. John G. Avery.
- S. 6682. Susie E. Harris.
- S. 6702. Walter Morrell.
- S. 6703. James W. Jacobs.
- S. 6704. John W. Rankin.
- S. 6729. George Krone.
- S. 6786. Jeremiah Adams.
- S. 6806. George W. Cartwright.
- S. 6811. Samuel Shaffer.
- S. 6815. Warren J. Hazell.
- S. 6819. Frank B. Gillespie.
- S. 6838. William Bays.
- S. 6842. Nancy J. Nicholson.
- S. 6846. Samuel Roberts.
- S. 6851. Charles S. Morse.
- S. 6869. Sanford A. Herendeen.
- S. 6877. William H. Brown.
- S. 6911. Henry A. Smith.
- S. 6929. George O. Miller.
- S. 6933. Peter P. Chacey.
- S. 6938. Eloise Warner.
- S. 6954. George W. Case.
- S. 6958. Emma Perkins.
- S. 6960. John C. Simpson.
- S. 6969. Aquilla M. Hizar.
- S. 6976. Luther M. Blackman.
- S. 6990. John J. Calkins.
- S. 6992. Jennie O. Collins.
- S. 6993. James L. Van Allen.
- S. 6997. Clarence C. Tridle.
- S. 6998. William Dickerson.
- S. 7005. Joana Boone.
- S. 7006. Fletcher N. Wilson.
- S. 7017. Beulah C. Hicks.
- S. 7033. A. Paul Horne.
- S. 7034. Ellen C. Gardner.
- S. 7036. Annie R. Jewett.

S. 7037. Ann Jolly.
S. 7061. Allen P. Gibson.
S. 7075. Rachel W. Carney.
S. 7076. Alie McGloughlin.
S. 7077. William A. Heames.
S. 7079. Delilah Lobenthal.
S. 7087. James Hammond.
S. 7089. Henry Walker.
S. 7092. Prudie M. Reynolds.
S. 7117. Fernando W. Moon.
S. 7127. Joseph Ludiker.
S. 7128. Jerome B. Wright.

S. 7134. Robert Conn.
S. 7137. George L. Neal.
S. 7138. Fernando Miller.
S. 7160. Anna E. Babbitt.
S. 7162. George W. Shoop.
S. 7182. Clifton Whittum.
S. 7191. George R. Davis.
S. 7219. Al Clark.
S. 7223. Charles F. Smith.
S. 7232. Louisa E. Catterson.
S. 7298. Arvilla B. Hammond.

The bill as amended was ordered to a third reading, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. RUSSELL, a motion to reconsider the votes by which the several bills were passed was laid on the table.

GEORGE WASHINGTON GLICK.

Mr. TAGGART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate concurrent resolution 28, accepting the statue of George Washington Glick, presented by the State of Kansas, and tendering thanks of Congress therefor.

I will state that by an oversight the Senate concurrent resolution had not reached the House at the time of the ceremonies incidental to receiving the statue which had been placed in Statuary Hall.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which he sends to the Clerk's desk.

The concurrent resolution was read, as follows:

Senate concurrent resolution 28.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the statue of George Washington Glick, presented by the State of Kansas to be placed in Statuary Hall, is accepted in the name of the United States, and that the thanks of Congress be tendered the State for the contribution of the statue of one of its most eminent citizens, illustrious for his distinguished civic services.

Second. That a copy of these resolutions, suitably engrossed and duly authenticated, be transmitted to the governor of the State of Kansas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 21318, the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 21318, the sundry civil appropriation bill, with Mr. CRISP in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF MINES.

For general expenses, including pay of the director and necessary assistants, clerks, and other employees in the office at Washington, D. C., and in the field, and every other expense requisite for and incidental to the general work of the bureau in Washington, D. C., and in the field, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, \$70,000.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Within a few days I have received a letter from a gentleman who is an officer of a gas company, in which he says:

I inclose a postal I received this morning showing how the United States Government is spending the money of the public for the benefit of some technical people. I have no sympathy with that kind of thing.

The card which he inclosed was addressed to him.

Mr. BARTLETT. What kind of people did he say?

Mr. GILLETT. Technical people. The card which he inclosed was addressed to him from the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines. That card reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF MINES.

PUBLICATIONS ON THE TECHNOLOGY OF OIL AND NATURAL GAS, JANUARY, 1915.

Technical Paper 32: The cementing process of excluding water from oil wells, as practiced in California, by Ralph Arnold and V. R. Garfias. 1913. 12 pp., 1 fig.

Technical Paper 37: Heavy oil as fuel for internal-combustion engines, by I. C. Allen. 1913. 36 pp.

Technical Paper 38: Wastes in the production and utilization of natural gas, and methods for their prevention, by Ralph Arnold and F. G. Clapp. 1913. 29 pp.

Technical Paper 42: The prevention of waste of oil and gas from flowing wells in California, with a discussion of special methods used by J. A. Pollard, by Ralph Arnold and V. R. Garfias. 1913. 15 pp., 2 pls., 4 figs.

Technical Paper 66: Mud-laden fluid applied to well drilling, by J. A. Pollard and A. G. Heggen. 1914. 21 pp., 12 figs.

Technical Paper 68: Drilling wells in Oklahoma by the mud-laden fluid method, by A. G. Heggen and J. A. Pollard. 1914. 27 pp., 5 figs.

Technical Paper 72: Problems of the petroleum industry; results of conferences at Pittsburgh, Pa., August 1 and September 10, 1913, by I. C. Allen. 1914. 20 pp.

Technical Paper 79: Electric lights for oil and gas wells, by H. H. Clark. 1914. 8 pp.

NOTE.—Only a limited supply of these publications is available for free distribution, and applicants are asked to cooperate in insuring an equitable distribution by selecting publications that are of especial interest. Requests for all papers can not be granted without satisfactory reason. Publications should be ordered by number and title. Applications should be addressed to the Director of the Bureau of Mines, Washington, D. C.

I suppose this is merely a specimen of the activity of the Bureau of Mines in advertising their wares and publications throughout the country to persons whom they think they might interest. Obviously they have a force of clerks who must be engaged in finding out the names of officials in different parts of the country engaged in business affected more or less remotely, and then they send out to them these cards, and then, I suppose, often replies come asking for the free bulletins, and then they come to us and tell us of the great demand there is for their papers and the great good they are doing to the public.

I suppose very few of those who receive them have the thoughtfulness of my correspondent, to consider that the money of the public is being wasted in this way or to write to their Congressmen objecting.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Does the gentleman know that in all the departments of the Government they endeavor to extend to the limit all their publications?

Mr. GILLETT. I do not know it, though I had suspected it. I did not know that that was being done by the Bureau of Mines. It does not seem to me that it is a proper expenditure under their appropriation.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Is the gentleman aware that there are a great many wells from which natural gas is escaping and that the by-product of gasoline can be manufactured from the natural gas and that these very papers to which the gentleman refers are technical papers that will enable the owners of the gas wells to furnish one of the best by-products that can be obtained?

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that that knowledge is primarily obtained by the Bureau of Mines. The companies that are engaged in such business throughout the country are the ones specially interested, and they do not need the Bureau of Mines to tell them what to do. There are scientific papers published in the country which publish discussions and the self-interest of these companies, who are all the time experimenting, do not need the Bureau of Mines to issue technical papers to direct them how they shall carry on their business.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. GILLETT. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. If this bureau has discovered how to make a by-product from natural gas, which is now being wasted from the majority of wells in the United States; if it has discovered a method of manufacturing a by-product that is used universally as gasoline is, does not the gentleman think that that technical knowledge should be disseminated?

Mr. GILLETT. The gentleman says they make gasoline from natural gas?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. They do. Does not the gentleman think that this valuable information should be disseminated by publications?

Mr. GILLETT. No; I do not believe that that is a Government function. If there is some such discovery, I do not believe it was made by the Bureau of Mines. Such discoveries are made by persons in the business. I do not think there is any danger that such a great discovery will not be disseminated by scientific papers and scientific men throughout the country—I do not think it is necessary for the United States to go into the business of circulating this information to persons whom they suspect may be interested. They are being sent now to New England—this long card about oil wells. It is a waste of time and a waste of money. Of course occasionally a correspondent may send back his protest, but what most men will do is to say, "Here are papers I can get for nothing, and I will send on and get them." And most of them will go into the waste basket. I do not think it is necessary for the Bureau of Mines to be disseminating knowledge of this sort, because I believe there are journals that will do it, and I believe that the self-interest of corporations is going to keep them in touch and abreast of the discoveries.

I do not think it is right for them to in this way try to work up a circulation and then come to us and tell us what great circulation they have and how popular their publications are.

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. If we stop paying for this kind of work, will not the occupation of some of these scientific gentlemen be gone?

Mr. GILLETT. That is doubtless true, and it works both ways.

Mr. BARTLETT. A great many of these scientific investigations are inaugurated by these scientific gentlemen in order for them to keep their positions.

Mr. GILLETT. I think that is true; it employs a lot of men in issuing elementary pamphlets giving facts which might be found elsewhere, and it discourages the natural organs, the newspapers and scientific papers, because they must compete with this voluntary gratuitous service, so that it seems both a waste and an abuse.

I did not know that this was being done by this bureau. This card came to me, and I thought I would call the attention of the House to it. May I ask the chairman of the committee if he knows under what appropriation these clerks are employed to find out what men throughout the country would be available as receivers of such information and how these men who write the pamphlets are paid?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They have editorial assistance, and it is provided for under this particular item.

Mr. GILLETT. Page 98, line 13?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They have two editorial assistants and various kinds of clerks.

Mr. GILLETT. I presume that is the section. But it seems to me there is a great waste of efficiency here. There is probably a very small percentage of their distributions and output which reaches persons who are really improved by it, and I think those who need it would find it in some other way.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This bureau requested additional money for clerk hire and other service. The committee was convinced that the bureau was provided with sufficient clerical force; that if the service were devoted to the collating of information and making it available to those who are really interested and to whom the information would be desirable they would secure it without having it forced upon them like unwilling patients taking drugs, and the bureau would do the work much better than it does.

Nearly every service of the Government is afflicted with one-malady, and that is an overpowering desire to be exploited in the public press and to magnify the importance of its work, to compel the people to read their publications, regardless of the particular value of the publications to particular classes of people. A few years ago it was ascertained that the bureaus in some of the departments of the Government maintained press bureaus, publicity bureaus, the chief purpose being to stimulate public interest so as to coerce Congress into appropriating money in larger sums than, in the good judgment of Members of Congress, were needed for the proper conduct of the public service.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Is that practice entirely discontinued now?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is not entirely discontinued; and it is by the bringing to light of such matters as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] calls to the attention of the House that something can be done to impress upon the executive officials of the Government that Congress has always been hostile to the so-called business of publicity methods that may be appropriate commercial enterprises but which is inconsistent in the conduct of the public service.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. HULINGS. On page 97 there is an appropriation of \$135,000 for the investigation of mineral fuels, and so forth.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We have not yet reached that.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, there is no question but that the departments of the Government are at times subject to criticism on account of their self-exploiting methods. As just stated, it has been found necessary in times past to somewhat limit the activity of some of these enterprising gentlemen in spending the public money for purposes that bordered on self-advertisement; but I do not believe that the Bureau of Mines is properly subject to criticism in its methods of furnishing information to the public. I do not believe that it is subject to criticism at all in the case before us. We have an appropriation carried in this bill for inquiries and investigations concerning the mining, preparation, treatment, and utilization of petroleum and natural gas, with a view to the economic development and

conserving of the resources through the prevention of waste, a very wise appropriation, in my judgment. There has been in this country a very sinful waste of our resources in gas and oil, and while it is true that it is not the duty of the Federal Government or the province of the Federal Government alone to prevent that waste, to overcome it, to discourage it, Congress has believed, and wisely, that it is proper for us to use the agencies of the Federal Government in a legitimate way for the purpose of disseminating among the people information, first, as to the facts of these great losses, and, second, as to the methods of their prevention. Each one of the bulletins referred to has to do with the conservation of our oil and gas resources. I happen to know something about each one of these bulletins. I believe they are each and every one of them valuable and useful.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, has the gentleman read them?

Mr. MONDELL. I will not say that I have read them all through carefully, but I have read some of them, and I have glanced through them all, so that I know in a general way their contents.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand technical paper No. 57 issued by this Bureau of Mines on the suitability of natural gas for making gasoline, by George A. Burrill, something I stated a few moments ago, which was disputed by several gentlemen on the floor.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to refer to that a little later, if I have the time. If it is proper that we should inquire into this waste and inquire into the methods of prevention, it is highly important, it seems to me, that we should have the widest possible dissemination and distribution of this information, and in these busy days, when men engaged in industries do not have time to read everything in the newspapers and keep thoroughly abreast with everything that is going on, it is frequently necessary to challenge their attention in regard to matters that are of vital interest to them in regard to matters that they are very glad to know about but which might entirely escape them if their attention was not challenged in that way. What the Bureau of Mines does is to get the addresses of people whom they believe to be interested in these matters and notify them on a postal card of these publications and of how they may be obtained. Many of them are sold, so that, as a matter of fact, the Government does not lose the entire cost of publication.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. And if we are going to make these investigations, if it is proper that we should, it is highly important that the public should be informed with regard to what is being done. So much for that.

There is, however, a criticism to be made, a legitimate criticism, of almost every Government bureau under the flag, a criticism that, I regret very much to say, applies somewhat, though not in the same degree that it does to others, to our good friends of the Bureau of Mines. Congress does not contemplate, and none of us believes, that it is possible for the agents of the Federal Government to go into these technical questions as to the utilization of products as thoroughly as individuals or corporations owning and interested in them do and will do, and we do not ordinarily expect these agencies to make startling discoveries with regard to the utilization of these products. It is true that they will here and there make a discovery that is important and valuable and useful—they have done so—but there is a temptation to find out what other people are doing, and then, through a peculiar mental process, come to the conclusion that the department agents have discovered the process. Take, for instance, this process of the manufacture of gasoline from gas. I presume it is true that the agents of the department have illuminated that subject somewhat. They may have made some valuable discoveries, but hundreds of thousands of dollars have been expended by private parties in successfully working out those processes. There are very considerable industries in the country to-day manufacturing gasoline from gas.

Take the other phase of the question, the manufacture of motor spirits, which is a substitute for gasoline and sometimes sold as gasoline, from the heavy product of petroleum. Formerly we took from the petroleum only the amount of gasoline that could be secured by ordinary processes of distillation. But the demand for gasoline and motor spirits became so great

that there was not a sufficient amount of gasoline obtainable in that natural way from the oils of the country. Then began investigations of the possibility of securing motor spirits or gasoline from the heavy oils. I am told that one corporation of this country spent in the neighborhood of a million dollars before they worked out a successful process of manufacturing motor spirits from the heavy oil. Two years ago there was erected in my State a very large and very expensive refinery, which is taking the heavy oil which was largely valueless and manufacturing motor spirits from it. Now, I do not think the Bureau of Mines have as yet claimed to be the discoverers of that method, but my recollection is that there has been some suggestion in some of their publications that might lead one to believe that they had been largely instrumental in that very valuable and useful work. These gentlemen do not need to claim discoveries made by others, either directly or by suggestion, because they justify their employment in reporting the experience of others, in finding what the best practice is in the country, and then informing the people the country over in reference to it. There is a temptation on the part of the bureaus in sending out information which is useful and legitimate to make at least as much of a claim of originality in the matter as the facts will warrant. Of course there is a certain amount of original research being done by the department, and many new methods are developed and given to the world, but the work of the bureaus, to a large extent, is to make available facts already known by somebody.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be some criticism of the distribution of these circulars of information; in this particular case those issued by the Bureau of Mines. I have always believed that there was a latent danger that must be guarded against in all bureaus and departments of the Government in seeking a sort of advertising propaganda, or self-exploitation, and yet that danger is so natural and so inherent that it must be reckoned with as an incident of any activity of that kind in which the Government engages. The fact that such latent danger exists does not discount the value of the activities to the public. I do believe, on the other hand, that as this scientific information is gathered by the scientific experts, paid for by the Federal Treasury, the only possible value of those investigations and those compilations of scientific data and statistics is to get them into the hands of the people who are interested in that particular industry. If we allow that information, after it is gathered, to accumulate in the vaults in Washington because we feared that some expense will be incurred in printing and putting it before the people, we are saving at the wrong end. We are destroying the value of what has taken a good deal of money, time, and labor to create. In other words, the only value of this information from any governmental aspect is to put it into the hands of the people, and primarily into the hands of those whose business and activities make a demand for that kind of information. So that it strikes me it is perfectly legitimate to get it before the people, provided, of course, that it is valuable and accurate to a reasonable extent—not accurate in extent beyond criticism, but to a reasonably accurate extent.

Now, it is perfectly true, as the gentleman from Wyoming has said, that private enterprise, private initiative, can be depended upon to exploit almost any source of wealth in this country, and yet the very purpose of creating these governmental bureaus is to conserve the natural wealth for the benefit of all the people and not necessarily for the few with the facilities and means to exploit them for their own private gain. That is especially true of this gas proposition. Why, there is no doubt but what natural gas and oil are exploited by men with large capital in the hope of profit and much has been discovered in that way which adds to the industries of the country, of course. And so, when a wealth has been discovered, and it is a natural wealth, it ought to be in some way or other conserved for the full benefit of the people. We have found in the gas belt particularly that gas and oil are found in conjunction almost always, and the oil is capable of an immediate return on the money, but the gas is not always readily salable or controllable. The owner of an oil well will allow his gas to escape into the air in order to realize quickly a little cash out of the oil. Now, that practice may be all right from his standpoint but all wrong from the standpoint of the people who are going to need both oil and gas, and who are entitled to have this natural wealth conserved. This department, as I understand it, among other things, has a practice of instructing the ordinary prospector in the oil and gas fields that there is a way to seal up the wells, and prevent the escape of the gas from the strata of the gas sand. It sends out a report and dis-

seminates that information among the people. I do not understand they are claiming they discovered the method of reducing gasoline from gas—head gas—because I think I know the gentleman who claims to have discovered that method in his commercial operations. Yet they have a right to investigate it for the public at large and for those who think they can engage their capital in promoting that industry. In the absence of that information that industry can not be carried on—

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. I will.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. There is a statement here in this report of Mr. Burrill, or, at any rate, it is published by the United States Geological Survey, which says in 1911 about 7,500 gallons of gasoline was produced from natural gas in the United States.

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That was disputed on the floor a few moments ago—that you can produce gasoline from natural gas.

Mr. BORLAND. Yes. The gas from which gasoline is produced is known technically as casing-head gas. It differs slightly in its constituents from natural gas. There is some difference among scientists as to whether casing-head gas is really natural gas or whether it is the volatile distillation of the oil, but, in any event, it exists in most oil wells.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] asks to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BORLAND. The value of that consists in this, that a large number of prospectors are in the field prospecting for oil. Oil can be readily turned into money. They find gas, possibly natural gas, or else casing-head gas, and if it is casing-head gas it contains this gasoline, which can be produced by pressure. Ordinarily they would lose and the public would lose the value of that particular commodity, but the desire to conserve it is very strong among the departments of the Government, and it ought to be strong among the general public, and is as soon as any information is given to the public about it.

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman explain that matter of casing-head gas a little further? Does that casing-head gas come out of the ground?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. PLATT. How, then, could it be anything else but natural gas?

Mr. BORLAND. There is natural gas, the qualities and characteristics of which are well known and understood, and then there is a gas called casing-head gas, which comes out from oil wells and which may be mingled with natural gas but which is assumed to be the natural distillation from the oil.

Mr. PLATT. It is a vapor, then?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; a vapor from the oil.

Mr. MONDELL. Is it not a fact that gasoline can be produced from practically any natural gas, but that you must get a natural gas having a certain amount of moisture in it before you can make gasoline at a price that pays commercially?

Mr. BORLAND. No. My understanding in regard to that is—

Mr. MONDELL. That is a fact.

Mr. BORLAND. My understand is that there is natural gas from which you can not produce gasoline at all. I have seen that demonstrated by scientists and experts. It is called "dry gas." There is a natural gas, a gas which has mingled with it the fumes of oil, and in the last analysis the gasoline is found in the fumes of the oil, even though it be a constituent part of the natural gas. But that is only a matter of detail. In all the gas belt of West Virginia and Ohio and of Oklahoma and southern Kansas they are not concerned chiefly with exploiting that from a commercial standpoint. Natural gas is usually available, if it can be conserved, to the inhabitants of the great cities, and it ought to be conserved in most cases, not for manufacturing primarily, but for domestic use primarily. The flat dweller and the small home owner and the little housekeeper in the cities must hurry to his work and must prepare his meals in a small home, perhaps in the suburbs of the city, in a limited time. The use of natural gas and its cheapness and its cleanliness and the small space it can occupy as compared with other forms of fuel is a great advantage and a great saving to the small, limited householder in the great cities, and he is the man primarily interested in the very last analysis in preserving the natural supply of gas and fuel in this country. He is the man

who must meet the fuel bill, and not the great corporation, which may choose to throw away its gas rather than go to the expense and trouble of conserving it.

But my idea is that those natural resources do not belong entirely to the corporation that happens to be exploiting a particular product, such as the oil, but if those natural products are there, they ought to be for the benefit of the entire community and of the wage earners and of the householders that are within reach of them. We would make a mistake—a very grave mistake—in allowing pure commercialism to dictate the destruction of that valuable commodity. The time may come when we would be glad to see it conserved for domestic and manufacturing use, and I hope it is not going too far to say that as to natural gas in this country Federal legislation will eventually step in and provide for its conservation, as it has done for the conservation of a great many other commodities which are of no more importance in the last analysis to the people.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. In Oklahoma, where the Bureau of Mines has demonstrated how this natural gas can be conserved, as stated by the gentleman, the legislature is taking action now in order to protect the gas in that State. That is brought about through the Bureau of Mines.

Mr. BORLAND. Yes. The fact is that the information furnished by the Bureau of Mines is not information furnished to some corporation for their private profit, but is furnished to the public at large, whether they want to engage in either production or consumption.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the Bureau of Mines should be criticized, but, on the contrary, should be commended for what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] has called to our attention, in placing bulletins and technical papers at the disposal of those in this country who are interested and disseminating throughout the length and breadth of the land information concerning the valuable and important discoveries and researches made by that new bureau of the Government. Of the commendable acts of the last Republican administration, not one stands out higher than the creation of the Bureau of Mines and the appointment of its able and efficient chief, Dr. Holmes, by former President Taft.

I know something of the value of the publications issued by this bureau, because I represent a mining district and have had transmitted to the mining companies and miners the valuable bulletins issued by the Bureau of Mines, and I know that while this bureau is comparatively young, only 4 or 5 years old, yet its great work has commended itself to the American Mining Congress, to mine operators, and to the men who work in the mines. There has been a demand upon the part of operators and miners for the Committee on Mines and Mining to build up, strengthen, and extend the operations of this valuable bureau.

Why, Mr. Chairman, if the Bureau of Mines, after making important discoveries and useful investigations, should fail or neglect to call the results to the attention of those vitally interested it would lay itself liable to the just criticism of Members of this House and of the taxpayers of this country, who want to see a return for the money expended in the creation, equipment, and maintenance of this bureau. In appropriating public money to establish and maintain this bureau it was expected to accomplish good and beneficial results. It has made good and it is very properly making known its splendid work to those most vitally interested and affected.

Why keep these bulletins and papers locked up, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] says, in cold storage here in Washington, when they could be sent out to persons and companies who are interested in the various industries which are affected; and what better use or value to the country could this bureau be engaged in than conserving the natural resources of this great country which have been going to waste on account of a lack of knowledge of expert mining, and so forth, and in the discoveries mentioned in the papers and bulletins referred to by the gentleman from Massachusetts? I hope, Mr. Chairman, that this House will always stand by, uphold, and defend the Bureau of Mines as long as it is so well and efficiently conducted as it is under its present administration.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to be put in the light, as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] attempts, of making an attack on the usefulness of the Bureau of Mines.

I recognize both the usefulness and the enthusiasm manifested by that department and its chief, and I recognize that it is only men who have a great enthusiasm in the work of their department and a desire to extend it who can be of great value; but the more there is of that enthusiasm and the more valuable a man may be the more he needs a check upon him, because these men see only what is before them. They see great opportunities, and they will branch out in every direction, regardless of expense, unless they are in some way supervised. Now, it seems to me the very arguments the gentlemen have made show that in this particular they have entered upon a field on which they ought not to encroach, because these technical papers are not meant for the public at large. The people in general are not interested in them. The people to whom they are of value are the capitalists and the corporations who are going into some great undertaking; and when doing that they are not going to rely upon the bulletins of the Bureau of Mines. They are going to investigate for themselves and find out what is the very last and best method; and while they may get interesting information from the Bureau of Mines, they can never take that as conclusive and final and sufficient. They have got to investigate and search out for themselves. So it seems to me these technical papers, which are doubtless of some value and which are intended to help these great corporations and the men who are going into these big undertakings, are not the line in which the Bureau of Mines ought to branch out; and sending out cards like this and trying to build up a constituency among people who might be interested, but to whom it seems to me they would not be of any very great use, is something which ought not to be encouraged.

Mr. FALCONER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

Mr. FALCONER. The gentleman would not have the bureau withdraw from this field and give it to the corporations exclusively, would he?

Mr. GILLETT. The corporations themselves do this investigating, and the bureau is merely gathering together what the corporations have done.

Mr. FALCONER. Not necessarily.

Mr. GILLETT. Practically so. They just find out what the corporations have done and then publish it.

Mr. FALCONER. Mr. Chairman, if I may interrogate the gentleman further—

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. FALCONER. Is it not a fact that the department does considerable pioneer work along these lines?

Mr. GILLETT. No; I do not think it does along these lines.

Mr. FALCONER. Then the gentleman takes the position that private corporations are always in advance of the department?

Mr. GILLETT. No; not always, but generally on these lines they are. It takes enormous capital to discover these things—too much for the bureau.

Mr. FALCONER. It just occurs to me that the argument of the gentleman would seem to mean that it is his position that the Government should abandon the field to the selfish interests of the corporations or private individuals.

Mr. GILLETT. This is just helping the selfish interests.

Mr. FALCONER. It may or may not be. Let me ask the gentleman, in that connection, is it not true that the Government has taken advanced steps in trying to find out whether or not it is advisable to extract gasoline from shale, and has any private corporation in the United States done that?

Mr. GILLETT. I do not know anything about that.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, it has come in my way to learn something about this oil business. I have been associated with it in one way and another ever since I began business. I quite agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] in saying that so far as the oil business is concerned this department simply collates and collects what has been done by the various concerns engaged in the oil business. I believe it was a man up in my own county who first discovered that he could make gasoline from the gas coming from oil wells. Of course it was generally known for a long time that you can take any gas, and by pressure and refrigeration reduce it to a liquid, as in the case of oxygen, for instance. But in these oil wells—and it is true of all of them—there is a kind of gas called wet gas, which contains certain chemical compounds that by pressure and refrigeration can be reduced to a liquid. That is being done all over the oil country, and has been for years. They produce a very light gasoline, of 0.80 specific gravity, and this they mix with gasoline of the heavier quality, that has been produced by the distillation of petroleum, and in that way make a gasoline which is better than the low grade made from

petroleum, and yet is not so volatile as to escape so readily as this high-grade stuff does that is made wholly from gas.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULINGS. Certainly.

Mr. BORLAND. I will ask the gentleman whether the product of this wet gas when reduced to a liquid by pressure and refrigeration is not more highly inflammable than the ordinary gasoline, and consequently can it not be carried in a small space and afterwards used with heavier gasoline?

Mr. HULINGS. It is probably not more inflammable, but it is much more volatile and more dangerous, because it evaporates so quickly. Take a spoonful of it and throw it into the air, and none of it will reach the ground.

Mr. BORLAND. As a practical proposition it is combined with heavier grades of gasoline.

Mr. HULINGS. They have been doing that and utilizing it largely in that way.

Mr. BORLAND. So that it is much more inflammable than the heavier gasoline produced in the old way.

Mr. HULINGS. I would not say more inflammable, because either of them will rapidly and almost explosively burn.

Mr. BORLAND. My understanding is that it is reduced in its production to about 15 per cent of its volume, so that it can afterwards be transported much more cheaply.

Mr. HULINGS. They have to transport it in steel barrels, because wooden barrels will not hold it, and for that reason they mix it with a heavier grade of gasoline. I do not believe that this bureau has ever invented anything along the line of the oil business. I think they have simply collated the experience of others, and made it available for any person that desired to learn it from these publications that they issue.

I wish to call the attention of the committee to the fact that in this same Bureau of Mines, in their investigation of the mining industry, especially of soft coal, they have been making discoveries; that they have been making the most valuable investigations for the protection of explosions from coal-mine dust in these mines. I think it would be very shortsighted for this Congress to attempt to limit them in that very important and interesting field.

There was one question I desired to ask the chairman of the committee. Here is an appropriation of \$135,000:

For investigation of mineral fuels and unfinished mineral products belonging to or for the use of the United States, with a view to their most efficient mining, preparation, treatment, and use, including personal services in the bureau at Washington, D. C., not in excess of the number and total compensation of those so employed during the fiscal year 1913.

Can the chairman say what that compensation amounted to?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman wait until we reach that item and I will give it to him?

Mr. HULINGS. I would like to say that as to the investigations of the gas business and the mineral-oil business of any sort I doubt whether the Government has any authority in that matter in territory which belongs to the States. Is it not a matter for State legislation to say how a man may utilize the product of his oil well where he has a title in fee to that property? The State, I suppose, under the right of eminent domain, might indicate or prescribe how certain wells shall be plugged or how the gas shall be taken, so that it shall be conserved, but I doubt whether the National Government has any right to do it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigation as to the causes of mine explosions, methods of mining, especially in relation to the safety of miners, the appliances best adapted to prevent accidents, the possible improvement of conditions under which mining operations are carried on, the use of explosives and electricity, the prevention of accidents, and other inquiries and technologic investigations pertinent to the mining industry, \$347,000.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I think I can get through the short statement I have to make in three minutes. I do not know whether it is true or not, but it is suggested from various sources that there is going on in this Chamber a kind of smotherbuster—not a filibuster, but a smotherbuster. I have listened now for about an hour to this debate. It is true the gentleman from New York finally moved to stop debate, and it was done. But I have listened about an hour to a discussion that seemed to me to be a part of an attempt to asphyxiate the shipping bill and probably the seamen's bill, for certain reasons, by the application of gas—dry gas, wet gas, heavy gas, light gas, Pennsylvania gas, natural gas, and all kinds of gas. [Laughter.] That is about all the debate has involved for an hour or more.

I think that there is more to this rumor than mere idle talk. I have participated here during this session in the putting through of the various appropriation bills, and although the chairman of this committee started out the other day with the resolution to rush the bill, and on Saturday afternoon exhibited a disposition to get the bill through as soon as possible, I have found that men can talk 5 minutes, 10 minutes, 15 minutes, and, as the Record will show, an hour has been consumed on various kinds of gas without any restraint or any attempt to suppress the debate or any attempt to expedite the bill. I think the proceeding is joined in by men on both sides of the aisle. It is a deliberate effort to obstruct legislation, and I think we ought to be more diligent. I would not presume to lecture the chairman of the committee, but I think if he would overturn the wishes of those about him and make more motions to suppress debate he would be serving the business interests of the country.

It is said that there will be an attempt to take up the Republican measure that has come over to the House, that farce which provides that ships of the Navy shall go into the merchant marine—

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. If the point of order is made, the Chair will have to sustain it.

Mr. BRYAN. Then, Mr. Chairman, I will get back to gas. Inasmuch as the gentleman from Pennsylvania wants everything discussed from a jet of gas, we will take up and discuss Pennsylvania gas. When these other matters are pending we ought to turn off the gas. That silly war challenge, the Weeks bill, ought to be made into a decent, effective merchant-marine bill, so that the ships of the Navy will not be put into commerce and our people be compelled to send freight and traffic by vessels with cannon and uniformed officers aboard. But we might put merchant vessels into the bill and give relief, and have an efficient bill, instead of having one that amounts to nothing; have one that makes the Shipping Trust protest, not one that makes the Shipping Trust applaud.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Washington having relieved the pressure on himself, due to an overaccumulation of gas, we will proceed to the next paragraph.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. TRIBBLE having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 7555. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Suwanee River in the State of Florida.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigation of mineral fuels and unfinished mineral products belonging to or for the use of the United States, with a view to their most efficient mining, preparation, treatment, and use, including personal services in the bureau at Washington, D. C., not in excess of the number and total compensation of those so employed during the fiscal year 1913, \$135,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 97, strike out lines 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and insert the following:

"For investigation of mineral fuels and unfinished mineral products belonging to or for the use of the United States, with a view to their most efficient mining, preparation, treatment, selection, and the most efficient use of fuels for all purposes; for the analyzing and testing of all fuels to be selected and sampled in accordance with Bureau of Mines specifications, including personal services in the bureau at Washington, D. C., not in excess of the number and total compensation of those so employed during the fiscal year 1913: *Provided*, That no part of any money appropriated by this or any other act shall be used for the purchase of fuel in continental United States for the United States, unless expended in cooperation, when practicable, with and under the advice and direction of the Bureau of Mines, \$135,000."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve the point of order.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, this changes the paragraph that is now in the bill so as to make it the duty of the Bureau of Mines to select the coal which is adapted to a particular plan where the Government plant may be located or particular equipment that may be used. It puts this selection with the Bureau of Mines, together with the testing, which is already there now. Since the Government has been testing coal according to a scientific basis as to the heat units in the coal it has been of great saving in all departments of the Government, wherever it may be, and yet the Bureau of Mines has no control over the equipment or matters of that kind. For instance,

there has been installed in a branch of the Government an equipment which is adapted to the use of coal in Illinois. It seems strange that that should be the case, and yet it is true. By changing that equipment and having it properly adapted to coal that may be within a certain neighborhood or area where it is to be used the Government would be able to save a considerable amount of money. At Fort Bayard, N. Mex., by change of certain equipment and showing them how they could use certain coal it was shown that they could use a very much cheaper coal. That was put in operation and existed for a little while, but was abandoned, and they have gone back to the old plan again; the Government is paying the extravagant price again. In California, where coal is shipped by the Government for use on the boats in the harbor and other uses, they use an expensive coal when they could just as well get coal on the Pacific coast which would save five or six dollars a ton. There is no occasion for this. Last year in the War Department alone in the buying of coal according to this basis there was a saving made of something like twenty-five to thirty thousand dollars.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman think it would be wise to give the Bureau of Mines authority to prescribe the kind of coal that the Navy is to use?

Mr. FOSTER. They do it now; it is done now. The bureau tests the coal for the Navy.

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, no; they do not.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, yes.

Mr. MONDELL. They have no authority over the Navy.

Mr. FOSTER. They have no authority over the Navy, of course.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman's amendment would give the Bureau of Mines authority to say to any department of the Government, including the Navy, "You shall use this sort of coal or that sort of coal."

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. It is the selection of the kind of coal that is best suited for their use.

Mr. MONDELL. Does not the gentleman think that would be dangerous when it comes to the fighting branch of the Government?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I do not think it is near as dangerous as it is now to the Government to permit in many instances some clerk in the department to select the kind of coal used in the department. The Bureau of Mines tests all of the coal used by the Navy. For instance, take the Panama Canal. When bids were presented for coal a certain firm in the country presented an analysis of coal which the Bureau of Mines said was not correct, which they had been using, but it was found by putting the selection of that coal in the hands of the Bureau of Mines for use in the canal there was a saving to the Government of \$40,000 a year. There are many instances of the kind where that can be done. As an illustration of the kind of selection the Government makes now, I have here a picture of the Knickerbocker Hotel, here in Washington, and then there is a picture of the Cox Building, which is a Government office building. We find that the Government office there is using anthracite coal with approximately 13,500 British thermal units per pound and paying \$6.65 per ton for it, and that the Knickerbocker Hotel buys coal of approximately 14,500 British thermal units per pound, bituminous coal, for \$4.50 a ton. That is the way that the Government in many instances buys its coal. I believe if some system were put in operation whereby we could select that coal in a proper way and say to these departments, "This is the coal that is most economical for your department" many thousands of dollars would be saved.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. HULINGS. The illustration the gentleman has given is a comparison between anthracite coal and bituminous coal. Anthracite coal has only 13,500 British thermal units to the pound—

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is not talking to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order. The gentleman from New York reserved the point of order, and under the practice of the House the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] is discussing the merits of the proposition, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS] interrogated him. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BRYAN. Is the gentleman debating the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is debating the merits of the proposed amendment.

Mr. BRYAN. Has the point of order been decided?

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order was reserved, and under the practice of the House the Chair is not called upon to rule while it is reserved. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois that his time be extended for five minutes? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This is a very important matter, and the gentleman from Illinois is chairman of the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Mr. BRYAN. I know that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And I think any reasonable discussion should be permitted.

Mr. BRYAN. I want to ask the gentleman from New York if he is going to make the point of order. Is it so very important that the gentleman is going to make the point of order?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am not certain.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, I was recognized to ask a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois has the floor. Does the gentleman yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. FOSTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS].

Mr. HULINGS. I desire to ask this: If the gentleman thinks that the illustration he has given here, making a comparison between anthracite and bituminous coal, is entirely fair, for this reason, that in the ordinary combustion of bituminous coal there is a very large portion of it that escapes during the process of combustion, while in the case of the anthracite coal the efficiency is very much higher?

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania falls into an error which is very often fallen into by men who do not remember that we buy coal upon the basis of so much heat to the unit of coal, and that in buying anthracite coal, which has the highest price, it gives you no more heat than does the bituminous that has the same number—

Mr. HULINGS. That is true if you get the same efficiency; but you never get the same degree of efficiency from the burning of bituminous coal, because a large portion of it goes off in the process of combustion in the way of smoke, and so forth.

Mr. FOSTER. That does not happen where there is a proper furnace equipment. It might be if it were done in the old way, but coal is not burned in such an unscientific way as it was years ago.

Mr. SLEMP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. SLEMP. Has the gentleman's observation been applied to coal used in the Navy also?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SLEMP. It would apply to the Navy as well as to all other departments of the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. I will say this: In the last naval bill there was provided \$75,000 for securing coal from the Matanuska coal field of Alaska, and the Secretary of the Navy put that under the control of the Bureau of Mines. They went there and mined that coal and hauled it to tidewater and brought it to the States, and that coal was tested upon the *Maryland*, I think, on the Pacific Ocean. An engineer of the Bureau of Mines went on the *Maryland* and saw the actual test of the coal. That coal was actually tested, and there is a letter in here from the commander of the *Maryland* showing how successfully and in what a gentlemanly way that test was conducted, and that it was to the satisfaction of the Navy, and it demonstrated beyond all question that the Matanuska coal was a kind of coal that could be used in the Navy. The Bureau of Mines tests this coal now; we have no new proposition so far as that is concerned, but what I am trying to get at is that when these tests are made and it is determined it is an economical coal for the Government to buy, that the Bureau of Mines shall select that coal and that these men will buy the kind of coal that ought to be bought as an economical proposition to the Government.

Mr. SLEMP. Would it be the gentleman's idea that the Government would bear the expense of testing coal that belongs to private individuals, corporations, and so forth, or that they should bear it?

Mr. FOSTER. This is for the Navy; that belongs to the United States; yes. The Bureau of Mines tests coal. They tested coal where an inquiry came from South America to have those tests to be supplied to those people who want to purchase

our coal. They made their test, and I understand sales of coal have been made as a result of that test.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I understood the gentleman to say just now that one of the purposes of the amendment of the gentleman was so that the Bureau of Mines could select the coal used by the different departments of the Government. How would the selection be made?

Mr. FOSTER. It is the recommendation or selection, as you may call it, wherever it is to be obtained. Of course there might be cases where it would be impracticable to make that—

Mr. MANN. But how would you select? Would you select it from some mine or how would it be done?

Mr. FOSTER. No; it would select certain coals that would be the most economical to use.

Mr. MANN. They do it now.

Mr. FOSTER. But in some instances—

Mr. MANN. Coal is selected based upon an analysis?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. It does not mean a certain coal to be used, does it?

Mr. FOSTER. Not a particular coal of a particular mine. It does not mean that.

Mr. MANN. I can not understand how the bureau can select the coal.

Mr. FOSTER. For instance, say the department is going to buy some coal for Fort Snellings. Say that they have bids for certain coal to be sent there. Those coals would be analyzed by the Bureau of Mines. Now, that would be determined by taking into consideration the equipment and everything connected with that particular point and an analysis of the coals which are sent would be selected for the particular place.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. FOSTER. And they would say to them this is the coal that should be selected.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] is doubtless very desirable, but the effect of this amendment is so far-reaching that, I think, it would be very unwise to attempt to legislate upon this bill. I have been examining the amendment of the gentleman for some time, and I have not yet been able to ascertain just how far it would extend the present authority of the Bureau of Mines.

Mr. FOSTER. I will say to the gentleman from New York, if he will permit me, that at this time the Bureau of Mines simply tests the coal when called upon by the different departments. They test it and give the analysis that the coal shows. That is as far as they go. They do not go any further now.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Under this amendment, as I read it and understand it, the Bureau of Mines practically is to select the equipment for the burning of the coal.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, no.

Mr. MANN. Well, then, what does it say?

Mr. FOSTER. If it does, it is not so intended.

Mr. MANN. Then the Bureau of Mines would tell the Navy, for example, what kind of equipment they should have for burning the coal, and, possibly, the kind of engines they should use.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, that is not intended; but if they happen to have a certain kind of engine, such as the Government has in certain places, or certain boilers adapted to particular kinds of coal, which they can not use, it seems to me somebody ought to select the equipment that would be adapted to the use of certain coal.

Mr. MANN. Of course the department that uses it ought to control that. I do not see how you can allow the Bureau of Mines to determine what kind of equipment they must have.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think it is intended that that should be the case.

Mr. MANN. I understood that was the purpose.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the uncertainties are too great, and I am compelled to insist upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For inquiries and scientific and technologic investigations concerning the mining, preparation, treatment, and utilization of ores and other mineral substances, with a view to improving health conditions and increasing safety, efficiency, economic development, and conserving resources through the prevention of waste in the mining, quarrying, metallurgical, and other mineral industries; to inquire into the economic conditions affecting these industries: *Provided*, That no part

thereof may be used for investigation in behalf of any private party, nor shall any part thereof be used for work authorized or required by law to be done and that is being done by any other branch of the public service, \$100,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] offers the following amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 98, line 1, after the word "service," insert "nor shall any part of any appropriation in this or any other act be used for work that is authorized or being done by the Bureau of Mines."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, this limitation, as I understand, upon the Bureau of Mines is for the purpose of preventing that bureau from entering any field that is now occupied by another department of the Government. What I had tried to do in my amendment was to prevent other departments from entering the field of the Bureau of Mines and limiting it, and saying to them that they must keep off the Bureau of Mines and let that bureau perform the work that it is intended it should do. Now, I submit that is but a fair proposition—that while the Bureau of Mines should keep on its own grounds, other departments should keep on their own grounds, too.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Who is to be the determining factor as to the particular province of each bureau?

Mr. FOSTER. The heads of the departments.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. In case of disagreement between the heads of departments, who should come in?

Mr. FOSTER. This would certainly be a limitation, which would be decided by the Comptroller of the Treasury.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. GILLETT. Suppose the law should allow different departments to overlap. The proposition is that the other departments should be excluded, and the Bureau of Mines would be authorized to do a particular kind of work, although the law already allowed the other departments to do it. Is that the proposition?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Some classes of work are authorized to be done by more than one branch of the public service.

Mr. GILLETT. That is just the question that I asked.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Only one branch should do it. I have suggested to the gentleman that he modify the amendment so as to apply it only to appropriations carried in this bill and to make the language correspond to the language already in the bill, so that the amendment would read: "Nor shall any part of any appropriation in this act be available for the performance of work authorized and being done by the Bureau of Mines."

Mr. GILLETT. But, after all, is that fair?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes. We apply that rule to the Bureau of Mines.

Mr. FOSTER. Why not apply it to the others, too?

Mr. GILLETT. Suppose there is a case where different branches of the Government have authority to do a particular kind of work. Now, by this you are taking it away from the others and giving it to the Bureau of Mines. Why would it be any more right to take it away from the other departments and give it to the Bureau of Mines than to take it away from the Bureau of Mines and give it to the other departments?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Why not strike out all of the provision after the word "party," in line 23, page 97? The trouble that my friend suggested is that it still further confuses, if he will allow me, a bad situation. What we have done in this item is to legislate against the Bureau of Mines. Then, if I understand the proposition of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER], he would insist on a provision under which it might be possible that none of the bureaus of the public service could do certain classes of work where they are now authorized by law to do it. The fact is, it is not fair to the Bureau of Mines to legislate against it alone, as we have done in this bill, because there are many fields of the public service where two or more bureaus legitimately work, although they do not work on a subject at the same angle, nor do they investigate exactly the same phases or features of a matter. They have their legitimate work, but it is connected with the same subject matter.

Now, we have legislated the Bureau of Mines out of any field heretofore occupied by any other bureau, even though they occupy it from a different angle and from a different viewpoint and for a different purpose and along a different line. We should not have any legislation of this sort, but the committees should see to it that the bureaus are kept out of each other's jurisdiction as far as possible, because if you legislate along this line at all you must legislate against one or the other of two or more bureaus.

Mr. FOSTER. I think what is intended here is that if you are going to limit the Bureau of Mines, it is only fair that the other departments should be limited so that they should not take that work away from it which it can perform better than any other department.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two minutes more.
The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOSTER. In securing the statistics in reference to mine accidents, if that is to be done by another department of the Government, it seems to me it is unfair to the Bureau of Mines, when they are in that work all the time, that that should be taken away from them. But without something of this kind, it must necessarily be taken away, and they would lose that part of the work.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman does not mean that this provision in the bill now would take away anything from the Bureau of Mines?

Mr. FOSTER. I should think so.

Mr. MANN. This is the existing law. I suppose they are complying with it.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope they are. But suppose some other department comes into the field? They have put in these new words this year:

And that is being done.

Mr. MANN. That broadens the scope of the Bureau of Mines, instead of restricting it. Under existing law they are forbidden to do any work which is authorized to be done by any other department. I do not think they pay much attention to it, but in a way they do. Now the committee have added these words so that any other department must not only be authorized to do it, but must actually be doing it.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. That broadens the scope of the Bureau of Mines, instead of restricting it.

Mr. FOSTER. As I understand, then, that excludes the Bureau of Mines from doing the work.

Mr. MANN. Only when the other bureau is authorized and is doing it. Under the existing law the Bureau of Mines is forbidden to do the work if the other department is authorized to do it, whether it is doing it or not. Now the committee have added to the language, forbidding the Bureau of Mines to do it only if another department is authorized to do it and is doing it.

Mr. FOSTER. The provisions in some of these are broad, and I know they have begun, where the Bureau of Mines has been doing it for several years.

Mr. MANN. But they are not doing it now, if they are following the law.

Mr. FOSTER. They are doing it?

Mr. MANN. I mean the Bureau of Mines.

Mr. FOSTER. They have been doing certain work, and the other departments are beginning to do that work. Now, what I want to do is to keep them out of the work of the Bureau of Mines, along with the others.

Mr. MANN. If the Bureau of Mines have ever lost jurisdiction of anything they have commenced to do, I have never heard of it.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope they have not, because they are doing good work, and I hope they will continue that work.

Mr. MANN. But the gentleman's amendment would forbid the Census Office to make any study of any of these industries. Certainly he does not want to do that.

Mr. FOSTER. No. It is simply to confine the other departments to their particular work.

Mr. MANN. But the gentleman's amendment would accomplish that, because one of the provisions is to permit the Bureau of Mines to inquire into economic conditions affecting industries relating to minerals, and so forth. The Census Office has to do that to make up the census report this year. The gentleman's amendment would forbid the Census Office to pay any attention to the industries relating to mines and minerals.

Mr. FOSTER. If the Bureau of Mines is securing these statistics, I do not see any reason for having them duplicated.

Mr. MANN. I do not think they are duplicated. If they are, the Bureau of Mines is doing the duplicating, because the Census Bureau is required to do this work, and the Bureau of Mines is merely permitted to do it. The gentleman's amendment would forbid the bureau that is required to do the work and turn it over to a bureau that has no facilities to do it, but is permitted to do it.

Mr. FOSTER. I think this only limits the departments to their particular work.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman withhold the point of order?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will withhold it.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois should be adopted, even if it were not subject to a point of order, because it would simply further confuse a bad situation, as I said a moment ago. This legislation, beginning with the word "nor" in line 23, page 97, and extending to the end of the paragraph, should be stricken out. We have no such legislation limiting any other bureaus of the Government. The result is that if the Bureau of Mines strictly interprets its authority under this legislation, then the Bureau of Mines is prevented from examining and investigating, let us say, the question of gases in mines, because the Bureau of Labor is also investigating that question from the viewpoint of the health and welfare of the miners. Now, the investigation of the matter of gases by the Bureau of Mines is an investigation with a view to determining how the accumulation of gases may be prevented and mines may be protected against gases; how explosions may be prevented; how miners who are the victims of gases may be rescued; and all those matters that properly come within the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Mines. There is a proper work for the Bureau of Labor, which is welfare work in the mines, and work having to do with the conditions of the labor. We do not say to the Bureau of Labor, "You shall not investigate this class of work, because the Bureau of Mines is investigating it from another angle," but we say to the Bureau of Mines, "You shall not do any work that any other bureau is either authorized to do or is doing, whether it is authorized by law to do it or not." You can not by legislation draw an accurate line between the activities of these bureaus. The best you can do is to exercise the control that Congress has over appropriations.

If this provision were stricken out, then the Bureau of Mines would be situated just as the other bureaus are, and would not be expected to occupy the same field in the same way and for the same purpose as they are occupied by other bureaus. Of course it is a question largely of what the word "work" means, what we intend by the word "work." I take it for granted that the Bureau of Mines is giving a liberal interpretation to it. If they are not, they must be tremendously hampered by this provision. I think they would be justified in holding that where they are doing a certain line of work, although it relates to the same subject matter as that under investigation by another bureau, if their work is along a different line, having a different object in view and a different purpose, they may continue that work. And yet there is likely to be a conflict of jurisdiction—there is likely to be some feeling engendered in a case of that kind. We should not put an embargo against the activities of one bureau in favor of all other bureaus. The proper thing to do is to strike out the entire provision. The gentleman from New York will recall that this was discussed somewhat in the subcommittee, that we were not entirely happy over the language, but even the genius of the gentleman from New York has not as yet evolved anything to take its place.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks one provision in the amendment, "or in any other act," makes it clearly subject to the point of order. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 98, line 1, after the word "service," insert the following: "Nor shall any part of any appropriation in this act be used for work that is authorized and is being done by the Bureau of Mines."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment. It is not germane to this paragraph of the bill. It might possibly be offered at the last end of the bill, but it is not germane to this paragraph of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER].

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this is directly in line with the provision already in the bill, and that this is a further limitation. I do not see why it is not germane to this particular item.

Mr. MANN. It does not relate to this particular appropriation. It is not germane to this paragraph.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems to me that it is clearly so; I may be wrong about it. I would not know where else to offer it.

Mr. MANN. The limitation in this paragraph relates to the appropriation carried by this paragraph only. It does not relate to the other appropriations carried by the bill. It seems to me that a limitation relating to all the other appropriations in the bill is not germane.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems to me that it is germane because it applies to this particular paragraph and is a limitation.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Colorado desire to discuss the point of order?

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. No; I propose to offer an amendment.

Mr. FOWLER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois desire discuss the point of order?

Mr. FOWLER. Just for a moment. I think this is clearly a limitation upon the appropriation. The paragraph provides for a certain amount of money to be appropriated for certain purposes, and it has been repeatedly held that where an appropriation is sought to be made, Congress may place any limitation on the use of the money that it may deem proper. I have recently gone over the authorities upon limitations, and in every instance where it was sought to place a limitation on the appropriation the Chair has overruled points of order. I can not see that this amendment carries with it anything except a limitation.

In 1910, in the bill for appropriations for the Navy, there was a provision for experiments on armament, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] offered an amendment that no part of the appropriation should be used except it be used under certain conditions of distance where the experiment was to be made. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] was in the chair, and he held that it was a limitation on the appropriation, and I think properly so. It has been repeatedly held that unless the amendment carries a direction to the department in the way of new legislation, limiting the department to do that which the law authorizes it to do, then it is a limitation on the appropriation and is in order.

Another point: If this amendment is subject to a point of order, the latter part of the paragraph is subject also to a point of order. If the latter part is subject to a point of order, then this ought to be in order, because it is germane to the subject matter and deals with the very same subject matter that the latter part of the paragraph deals with. It appears to me that on any ground that we may take it, from a parliamentary standpoint the amendment is not subject to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order made by the gentleman from Illinois was not on the ground that it was otherwise than a limitation, but on the ground that it was offered in a place in the bill where it was not germane. The Chair has the greatest respect for the opinion of the gentleman from Illinois on parliamentary questions. The Chair has considered this amendment, which in the opinion of the Chair is a limitation, and it is offered to a provision making an appropriation for the Bureau of Mines, and therefore the Chair overrules the point of order. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOSTER) there were—ayes 10, noes 25.

So the amendment was lost.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment. I move to strike out the language beginning on line 23, page 97, down to the figures "\$100,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 97, line 23, after the word "party," strike out the following language: "Nor shall any part thereof be used for work authorized or required by law to be done and that is being done by any other branch of the public service."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For per diem, subject to such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe, in lieu of subsistence at a rate not ex-

ceeding \$5 when absent on official business from his designated headquarters, and for actual necessary traveling expenses of said inspector, \$2,500.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order to the paragraph. This mine inspector in Alaska is there permanently, is he not?

Mr. FITZGERALD. He is in Alaska, but traveling all the time; he covers the whole Territory.

Mr. MANN. He gets a salary of \$3,000, and \$2,500 beside; that is, he has his subsistence all the time, besides the salary. I suppose he has to purchase his clothing himself, unless it is given to him.

Mr. FITZGERALD. His headquarters are at Juneau, and when he is away from headquarters he gets subsistence.

Mr. MANN. He is away all of the time, is he not?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Most of the time, I think. I think he is away from headquarters the better part of the time—that is, if he is trying to do the work that should be done.

Mr. MANN. If he is performing his work, he is. It seems to me we do pretty well when we pay a man a salary and then pay his board all of the time besides, and at that probably more than it costs him.

Mr. FITZGERALD. From the information before the committee the cost of living in Alaska is pretty high.

Mr. MANN. The law limits the subsistence to \$4.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The law limits a per diem in lieu of subsistence to \$4, but yesterday we fixed a per diem of the inspectors in the General Land Office at \$5.

Mr. MANN. They travel only occasionally, I take it, while this man is traveling all of the time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The requests for per diem for employees in Alaska from all of the departments of the Government is an allowance of \$8.

Mr. MANN. Yes. A good many of the departments would like to pay a man a good salary and in addition allow him quite a good rake-off from a per diem in lieu of subsistence.

Mr. BRYAN. Does the gentleman take into consideration the fact that a mine inspector, going from one to the other of these different diggings, has to go a great part of the time with a pack and a dog team, away from the inhabited sections we spoke of yesterday, which is very expensive traveling?

Mr. MANN. He gets that paid in addition, and it is very safe to say that having traveling expenses with a dog team paid his subsistence does not cost him \$5 per day. But that is what he gets. I am going to make the point of order against it. I think it is subject to the point of order under the sundry civil appropriation act of last year, which limits the per diem in lieu of subsistence to \$4 a day. I make the point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Then I shall offer the paragraph as an amendment, inserting \$4 a day instead of \$5.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order against the paragraph, and the Chair sustains the point of order. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 99, after line 8, insert the following:
"For per diem, subject to such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe, in lieu of subsistence at a rate not exceeding \$4 when absent on official business from his designated headquarters, and for actual necessary traveling expenses of said inspector, \$2,500."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I understand that on yesterday there was a provision inserted in the bill for a per diem in lieu of subsistence of \$5, which formerly provided for \$6. It was reduced to \$5. Is it now proposed in this amendment to make a reduction from \$5 to \$4 a day? I would ask the chairman of the committee why it is that the others should receive \$5 per day traveling through Alaska and this one \$4 a day?

Mr. FITZGERALD. My opinion is they should receive \$5 per day, but as such a provision is obnoxious to the rule, if any one objects, the only thing I can do is to offer an amendment that is in order under the rule.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no reason why one man should receive \$4 a day and another \$5.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman from Illinois said that his objection is that the inspectors of the General Land Office travel only occasionally, while this man is traveling all of the time and has an allowance that will equalize any excess the others have.

Mr. MANN. These land agents are now receiving a per diem at the rate of \$6, and that was reduced to \$5. This mining inspector is now receiving a per diem of \$5, and this would reduce him to \$4. It takes a dollar off each one.

Mr. FOSTER. Why should one have five and the other four?
Mr. MANN. Why should one have six and the other five?

Mr. FOSTER. There is no reason in the world that I know.

Mr. MANN. I think there is a very good reason, though I may be mistaken.

Mr. FOSTER. That is what I am trying to find out.

Mr. MANN. My understanding—and I do not assert it to be a fact—is that the mining inspector is away from his headquarters practically all of the time, while the others are not. There is a good deal of difference in the real cost. I may be mistaken about that.

Mr. FOSTER. What I do not understand is that when we are paying a per diem in lieu of subsistence why we should expect these men to make any money out of it. What difference does it make?

Mr. MANN. I do not think they ought to make any money out of subsistence.

Mr. FOSTER. Nor do I.

Mr. MANN. But I have no doubt that this mining inspector practically lives off the per diem and has his salary of \$3,000 net.

Mr. FOSTER. That may be so. I do not know.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection to it if he does. If we allow it, I do not blame him for doing it.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems to me it is hardly proper to allow one five and the other four.

Mr. MANN. We make a reduction of \$1 in each case.

Mr. FOSTER. It may be that both ought to be reduced.

Mr. MANN. That may be. I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, Bureau of Mines, \$757,300.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of extending my remarks in the RECORD by inserting an article from the Colorado Springs Evening Telegraph, giving an account of a shipment of ore very recently made from the Cresson mine, in the Cripple Creek district, the value of which amounted to \$361,000. This shipment was made in five cars, the first-grade ore in the shipment running 205 ounces of gold to the ton and the second grade running 104 ounces, which, figuring 25 tons to the carload, gives the amount of the highest grade at \$205,000 for the two cars, the entire shipment having a total value, as I stated, of \$361,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The article is as follows:

[From the Colorado Springs Evening Telegraph, Jan. 27, 1915.]

CRESSON SHIPMENT BREAKS RECORD HELD BY ISABELLA COMPANY—TOTAL WILL BE ABOUT \$361,000, ACCORDING TO "CONTROLS" MADE AT COPPELAND SAMPLER

About \$361,000 will be the total returns from the shipment of five carloads of high-grade ore from the famous vug of the Cresson mine, according to the control assays made by the Copeland sampler of Cripple Creek, which sampled the ore yesterday. The ore was divided into two classes, the highest grade being loaded in two cars, and a second grade in three cars averaging about 25 tons to the carload.

The controls reported to-day show that the first-grade ore will run about 205 ounces in gold to the ton, and the second grade about 104 ounces. Figuring 25 tons to the carload gives 50 tons of highest grade and 75 tons of second grade. The two cars of highest grade will therefore produce a total of \$205,000, and the three cars of second grade will total about \$156,000, making a grand total of \$361,000 for the shipment, not including the silver values. This is as close an estimate as can be made until the final returns on the shipment are received from the smelter at Omaha, to which place the ore was shipped. The sampler controls, however, are very accurate, and it is not expected that the final figures will vary much either way from the above.

In any event, it is now certain that the shipment from the Cresson is the record shipment from the Cripple Creek district, and its value is all the more impressive when it is considered that the ore forms only a portion of the gold found in one chamber no larger than the ordinary living room in a house.

The previous record shipment from the Cripple Creek district was that made several years ago by the Isabella Mines Co., which shipped one carload that aggregated about \$229,000.

Among the high-grade ore shipments by the mines of the United States, that made by the Cresson is surpassed only by a shipment of five carloads in 1907 from the Mohawk mine in Goldfield, Nev., which collected its highest-grade ore for a period of three or four months and sent out one shipment that netted approximately \$490,000 in gold and silver.

The Cresson has also shipped to the Golden Cycle mill several carloads of ore from the treasure chamber which have run 15 ounces of gold to the ton, an average of about \$300 to the ton, or \$7,500 to the carload. It is known that returns have been received on at least three carloads of this grade.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all expenditures authorized by the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stats., p. 388), and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, known as the reclamation law, and all other acts under which expenditures

from said fund are authorized, including salaries in the city of Washington and elsewhere; rent of office quarters in the city of Washington, \$8,040, and for rent elsewhere; examination of estimates for appropriations in the field; printing and binding; law books, books of reference, periodicals, engineering and statistical publications, not exceeding \$600; purchase, maintenance, and operation of horse-drawn or motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; per diem in lieu of subsistence, when allowed, pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914; payment of damages caused to the owners of lands or private property of any kind by reason of the operations of the United States, its officers or employees, in the survey, construction, operation, or maintenance of irrigation works, and which may be compromised by agreement between the claimant and the Secretary of the Interior; and compensation to artisans and laborers for injuries under the act of May 30, 1908 (35 Stats., p. 556), namely:

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, can the gentleman say how many automobiles this service has now?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They have motor-propelled vehicles on almost every project.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I have no doubt; but how many to the project on an average?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am trying to find out. I do not remember the number of automobiles, but this provision is largely for motor cycles. They are using them out there largely for ditch riders and others.

Mr. MANN. Well, I am not criticizing them for using them.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think I have a statement of the number of automobiles, but I do not just recall.

Mr. MANN. Oh, very well.

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman will permit, I think there is a statement on page 316 of the hearings of the automobiles in the service, the number, the power, and the cost.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of calling the attention of the committee to this fact: That, following the practice in connection with the examination of the estimates of the Panama Canal, the committee has made provision here to permit, if they deem it advisable, an examination of the estimates of these various reclamation projects. The tremendous advantage that will result to Congress and those who are engaged in the work made this seem to be desirable. The attention of the committee is called to it, so Members will understand, in the event that hereafter it should be determined a special committee should visit these projects for the purpose of examining and ascertaining the information that will be of value, that the matter was done with the full cognizance of the House. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will.

Mr. HAWLEY. Are these motor-propelled vehicles automobiles or Ford machines?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They are mostly Fords. [Laughter.] While they are not expensive automobiles, they are very serviceable, and these machines are more useful than high-priced cars would be.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. I notice the bill says nothing about how long the appropriations shall be available. I have been looking over some of the statutes regarding this matter and it is not clear to me, in view of the number of statutes upon the subject, that this should not in some way be made available longer than for the year for which the appropriation is made.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of the Interior requested that provision be inserted making the appropriations available until expended. The request was, in my opinion, due to a misapprehension of the law. In the first place, there is doubt whether it will be advisable to make appropriations available until expended. The moneys appropriated are all payable out of the "reclamation fund." If the money were made available until expended, should a sum considerably in excess of what would eventually be used be appropriated for a project, that sum would still remain to the credit of the project, to be used at some future time without further action by Congress, and be segregated out of the fund and perhaps prevent the making of appropriations that properly should be made for other projects. Under the law, as this appropriation is made for the fiscal year, the money can all be expended within that year, or that part which is not expended by the end of the year remains available for two years, to meet the obligations which were incurred during the year, or to meet obligations for contracts properly made during the year. Section 3690 of the Revised Statutes provides:

All balances of appropriations contained in the annual appropriation bills and made specifically for the service of any fiscal year, and remaining unexpended at the expiration of such fiscal year shall only be applied to the payment of expenses properly incurred during that year, or to the fulfillment of contracts properly made within that year; and balances not needed for such purposes shall be carried to the surplus fund.

That is all that is applicable to this provision. The act of June 20, 1874, limiting to two years the time within which the unexpended balances should be available, commonly referred to as the "covering-in act," provides that at the end of two years after the expiration of the fiscal year for which appropriations are made the balances then unexpended shall be covered back into the Treasury. In this instance it will be covered back into the reclamation fund.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Is it the opinion of the gentleman that the act to which he refers is not changed in any respect by section 7 of the act of August 24, 1912?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No. The section of the sundry civil bill to which the gentleman refers was designed to correct a certain ruling of the comptroller. The Comptroller of the Treasury had held that certain appropriations made for a specific purpose did not come within the provisions of the covering-in act, and the appropriations continued available indefinitely. The appropriations for the Reclamation Service would be affected by section 7 of the sundry civil act of 1912 to this extent: That it would be impossible to construe these appropriations as specific indefinite appropriations which would be affected by the covering-in act. The appropriations made here for the Reclamation Service would be the same as appropriations made for any other service for which annual appropriations are made. That is, the money can all be expended within the year, or if it is not actually expended within two years after the expiration of the fiscal year, the balance of it is available to make payments for work done within the year or to meet contract obligations where the contract was properly made. That is to say, where a contractor might be doing a certain work on a reclamation project he might be paid up to the 1st of May and then might continue working until the 30th of June; then for two years after the 30th of June the balance of the appropriation is available to pay any moneys due on that contract up to that 30th of June.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman is correct in that construction—

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is no doubt about that—

Mr. SMITH of Texas. And I am not prepared to say he is not, that would be all right.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Secretary of the Interior, I think, after consultation with the Reclamation Service, either misapprehended that condition or else the service may be somewhat variable under appropriations that have lapsed. They have been conducting this work heretofore without any possibility of having an appropriation lapse. Probably there is a natural fear on their part that the thing will not work out in a satisfactory manner. Now, the Committee on Appropriations—

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit me a moment, if these appropriations should lapse at the end of the year, of course it would put the Reclamation Service to a great disadvantage in making contracts.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I was about to say that the Committee on Appropriations, in making recommendations of these items, endeavored to recommend such sums as would enable the Reclamation Service without embarrassment to continue the work upon the projects during the next fiscal year, and while all of the money requested was not given in every instance, in those instances where there was a reduction in the amount recommended it was in the belief and confident conviction that the service would not be affected. For that reason for this year the 10 per cent interchangeable provision was included. There are two reasons for that. One was the statement of the head of the Reclamation Service as to the manner in which it had been necessary to prepare the estimates and the uncertainty as to whether it would be possible to make them with that close accuracy which would be essential to definitely determine how much could be expended. The other was the fact that the service was being put upon this basis for the first time, and that made it desirable to give them some leeway, so that the work should not possibly be embarrassed.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Wyoming?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not know whether I clearly understood the statement of the gentleman from New York with regard to the time for which these sums would be available, but what I did understand the gentleman to say was this—and I think the gentleman perhaps, if I correctly understood him, has not the understanding of the matter that I have—I understood the gentleman from New York to say that these appropriations were available for any work done during the year, and for any work done on a contract during the year.

Now, my understanding is that these appropriations are available for any work done during the year, whether paid for during the year or not. They are also available for any work done on any contract properly made within the year, whether the work on that contract is performed within the year or within two years thereafter.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think my statement was perhaps too restricted regarding the contract work. For instance, if an appropriation of \$500,000 is made upon a project and authority exists to make a contract up to \$500,000, it makes no difference whether the work is performed within that fiscal year or not. It may be performed under that contract in the next fiscal year, and the money is still available to meet the obligation arising in that way.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Certainly.

Mr. MONDELL. After discussing this matter with the gentleman from New York the other day, I called up the comptroller's office and asked them if there had been any questions raised, having in mind those words, "contracts properly made," as to whether a contract was properly made if it were made late in the fiscal year. I had heard that such a question had been raised several years ago with regard to a contract made on the last day of the fiscal year. I think it was a naval contract. But even in that case I understand it was decided that as it was a proper contract, and that although none of the work was done during the fiscal year, the sum was available at any time within two years after the expiration of the fiscal year.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Certainly.

Mr. HAYDEN. Conceding that the chairman is correct, so far as contracts are concerned, how about work done under force account?

Mr. FITZGERALD. As to work done under force account, the work must be actually performed during the fiscal year, and then the money is available to settle those accounts two years thereafter. It would not be available for work done after the 30th of June. In every department of the Government, of course, moneys for a current fiscal year, for instance, will be paid after the 30th of June on obligations.

Mr. HAYDEN. I understood that. The chief disadvantage, it seems to me, of not allowing this money to be expended beyond the fiscal year is that it happened before, when the Congress did not pass the appropriation until after the 1st of July, that work done in this service under the force account would be tied up.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Under these rulings I doubt if it would be. That is really an exceptional situation. The disadvantages that would come from making the money available until expended I have already pointed out. For instance, if \$500,000 were appropriated to build a project and \$250,000 were actually expended, the remaining money would be to the credit of that project; and if it remained there years afterwards, some one might come along, without action on the part of Congress, and expend it in a way not contemplated. And, again, if the amount were to remain available until expended, an attempt might be made to use it at some time when the condition of the reclamation fund would not permit it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Yuma project, Arizona-California: For maintenance, operation, continuation of construction, and incidental operations, \$725,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 102, line 3, after the word "operations," strike out "\$725,000" and insert "\$934,000."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment, restoring to the Yuma reclamation project the amount estimated by the department, because I am not satisfied with the explanation made last Saturday, on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations, by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] as to the reason for this reduction. The gentleman from Wyoming said that this action was taken by the committee for two reasons—first, that the committee understood that this appropriation was in the nature of an insurance against extraordinary floods on the Colorado River, and second, that they were influenced to take this action because of the testimony given by Gen. Marshall at the hearings, to the effect that the

river bed at Yuma had lowered some 7 feet, and that levees were, therefore, not needed.

I want to say that my information does not agree with the conclusion reached by the gentleman from Wyoming and the committee.

In the first place, certain levee work must be done on this project. It is immaterial whether it is done this year or next year, as far as the expense is concerned. The Committee on Appropriations can have no knowledge as to whether there are going to be great floods on the Colorado River between the 1st of July, 1915, and the 30th of June, 1916. Certainly the Weather Bureau could not give them advance information on this subject. Perhaps they have consulted some weather prophet, who told them that a dry year is now due.

The levee work, as I have said, must be done. It is best done, according to the testimony of the engineers, during the time of flood; that is to say, when the river is high and the banks are caving. If rock revetment work is done at that time, it serves a better purpose than if done when the river is low. There is a flood on the Colorado River every year in June. The crest of the flood comes between the 10th and the last day of that month. Some years it is higher than others, but the flood is so sure to come that levees are absolutely necessary if the bottom lands are to be protected from overflow. I can not understand how the committee could arrive at the conclusion that the appropriation was needed as a mere insurance against unusual conditions.

Neither do I understand about this 7-foot lowering of the bed of the Colorado River at Yuma. I know that when the Colorado River broke into the Imperial Valley the flow of the current was greatly increased, the river did wash back, and the bed was lowered for a time at Yuma. Since the river has been prevented from flowing into the Imperial Valley, however, the river bed has returned to its old level, and I understand that the situation there is just about the same as it was before the original break occurred.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. HAYDEN. I shall be glad to hear further from the gentleman about this matter.

Mr. MONDELL. The committee reduced this item, as I stated the other day, for various reasons. First we were assured by the service that all the estimates were liberal, and the hearings bear out that fact. Second, there is some doubt as to whether all of this rock-revetment work will ever be needed. It is true that it will be wise eventually torevet the toes of all of these levees, and to complete the levee system, on which nearly a million dollars has already been spent; but the height to which the rock revetment must be carried depends, of course, upon the height to which the river will rise or is likely to rise. Now, the probability is that the river under normal conditions, before the change of channel, would not have risen sufficiently to require as large an expenditure for rock revetment as has been estimated. But there has been a permanent lowering in the channel of the Colorado. The gentleman will recall that the old channel of the Colorado was the very highest territory in the valley. The river had gradually deposited its silt along its channel, and its bed had gradually risen until it was occupying territory higher than the lands on either side. Then the break came and the waters flowed over into the Alamo and toward the Imperial Valley. That break was finally closed, but the river was never forced back into its old channel. It was forced down into what I think is called the Bee River Channel and into Volcano Lake. Now, that entire stretch, down the Bee River and through Volcano Lake and into the Gulf, is considerably lower than the old channel of the river; and while it is true that there is not the same lowering of the channel of the river that there was when the break cut through and the water was running into the Alamo and down into the Sink, there is a permanent reduction of the level by reason of the change of the channel from the old bed into the Bee River and into Volcano Lake and down into the Gulf. Gen. Marshall put that lowering at about 7 feet.

Now, as I said at the beginning, this was at first a high estimate, admittedly so. Second, in the highest flood time under the old conditions, it was doubtful if as large a sum as this could be used in one year, because this rock-revetment work can best be done when the river is high, and can not be economically done except in the high or intermediate stages of the river. It was largely insurance against the utmost possibilities, under conditions of water level that do not now exist. We did not believe that it was wise to have several hundred thousand dollars apportioned to a project and taken from the fund to be held as a sort of insurance against possibilities, because all these sums may be used interchangeably for any of this work, and with the

reduction we have made there is still a large amount available for this levee work.

Then, in addition to that, the whole reclamation fund, or all of the appropriations made in this bill, can be drawn upon if necessary for this work, if the necessity of it shall become apparent during the year.

Mr. EAYDEN. As I understand it, only to the extent of 10 per cent of the appropriation for a particular project.

Mr. MONDELL. I think that is true. I do not know but what we might wisely make it 20 per cent; but at any rate 10 per cent of the amount for this project. Taking all these things into consideration, the fact that the estimate was high to begin with, and the fact that even then it was largely with a view to having a provision for every possible contingency; that it was made largely with a view to old river conditions; that the entire sum is available for this purpose if it should be needed; that you can draw 10 per cent more from the other projects if you need it—in view of these facts, it did not seem to be wise to take this sum and segregate it for a purpose for which it would not be needed.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have read the hearings carefully and I did not find anything in them to the effect that the Reclamation Service has made very liberal estimates.

Mr. MONDELL. During the hearings Mr. Ryan said that the estimates were all liberal—not especially for this project, but that they were all liberal.

Mr. HAYDEN. I might say for the information of the gentleman that I know that on this project the United States Reclamation Service has built a railroad along the bank of the river so as to make it possible to do the revetment work and complete the levees. That railroad line has recently been completed, so that the Reclamation Service is in a position to use all the money they can get for that work. It is not a question of inability to expend this appropriation during any high-water season.

Mr. MONDELL. That is true; they could organize a force great enough to use all this money in rock revetment on that project this year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman must understand that his people must pay for this expenditure. It is not to their interest to have work done that is not needed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Neither is it to their interest to have the work extended over a long period of time with large overhead charges.

Mr. MONDELL. The overhead charges would not be greatly affected by this. My own opinion is—and I think I am pretty familiar with the Colorado River situation, for I have followed it pretty carefully from the time, some 14 years ago, when the Imperial Valley people were first trying to get their right of way—we have already spent a million dollars on this levee system, the building of which was not anticipated at the time we undertook the project. It is an awful burden there now. We ought not to take any chances of losing any part of it. But at the same time it is not wise to spend more money in rock-revetment work than is actually needed.

I am of the opinion that the reclamation people are not fearful the levees are going to be washed away if they do not use all this sum. They could spend a great deal of money and carry the rock revetment to the top of the levee. But if it is true, as Gen. Marshall told us—and he is about the best living authority on the subject—that the Colorado is permanently 7 feet lower than before, we would have built 7 feet of rock revetment on that project at a very great unnecessary cost, which the people of the project would have to pay.

I want to suggest to the gentleman that this is a little different from river and harbor appropriations. His constituents are expected some day to reimburse Uncle Sam for all the work, and while I do not suggest that in cutting down the estimate, the committee is trying to discourage the Reclamation Service from doing unnecessary work, if the failure to appropriate all the sums that they might possibly use would have the effect of keeping their expenditure within what is necessary, the gainers would be the constituents of my friend from Arizona. They would be the people that would gain, and they can not lose, because no one has suggested that there is an emergency existing here which necessitates the putting in of all of the rock revetment at once, and there is grave doubt whether it will ever be all needed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Doubt may exist in the mind of the gentleman from Wyoming, but not in the minds of the people at Yuma.

Mr. MONDELL. It exists in the minds of the reclamation people, in my opinion.

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not find any such thing in the hearings.

Mr. MONDELL. I think there are a number of things that were said during the hearings on the reclamation items that gentlemen may not find in the printed hearings. I do not know who is responsible for that, but I have a very lively recollection of what was said and I discussed this matter with gentlemen of the Reclamation Service, and I know, and I am confident that in the hearings it was stated, whatever the printed hearings may show on that point, that this was in the nature of an insurance or a considerable part of it, and that there was no certainty that it would all be needed.

Now, it is not in the interest of my friend's constituents that we shall encourage the service to build up the rock revetment above any possible rise in the river. On the contrary, we have given enough so that there is no danger of the work going out, no danger of any injury being done. A little more than \$152,000 will remain for this purpose, assuming that all of the reduction is taken out of flood protection. If a little more is necessary there is the 10 per cent available, and the whole sum is available for any particular feature if needed. I have not the slightest idea that the service ought to spend, in the interest of that project, more than the amount suggested, \$150,000, on the rock revetment and extension of the dikes this year.

Now, one word more. I think the gentleman realizes that the committee in passing on these items did not intend to limit or restrict or reduce any of these items in the way that by any possibility could work a real injury to a project. In only one case, which may be referred to later, was our reduction with the idea that the work contemplated by the service might not be needed for the next two or three years. Reductions were generally made with the idea that all the work which the service contemplated and which the service would perform during the year could be carried out and performed for the sums which were approved.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the committee came to the conclusion that there was some doubt as to the ultimate necessity for this expenditure. The appropriation is very largely for flood protection. There is some question whether the project will ever pay if the money to be expended for flood protection is charged against the project. There was some uncertainty as to the necessity for building these dikes and the emplacement of a rock revetment. Already, I think, \$1,000,000 have been expended for that work, and if all is done that was originally contemplated, about \$2,000,000 will be expended. That is a very considerable sum of money to be charged against the land. I want to say to the gentleman from Arizona that in recommending this reduction it was not with the idea of in any way interfering with the project, but it was in the belief that perhaps the work originally contemplated would not necessarily be required. To that extent, of course, those interested in the project would rejoice. No one wishes more expended upon it than possible.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is perfectly true.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And there being some doubt as to whether it would be necessary, with the additional information acquired in connection with an investigation conducted relative to the item that was inserted in the bill for the protection of Imperial Valley, the committee believed that it could safely reduce the amount recommended by \$200,000. If it should happen that when Congress convenes in December, with further information in the hands of the Reclamation Service, it is apparent that beyond any question this particular work should be done within the fiscal year, then, so far as I am concerned, I would be very glad to unite, as I have no doubt from time to time it will be necessary to do, with others to make provision for additional sums for some of these projects that are recommended.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, of course I do not ask for a cent to be expended on the Yuma project that is not necessary, because it must all ultimately come out of the pockets of the farmers there; but I do think that, as their Representative, I ought to do everything within my power to see that sufficient funds are provided to take care of any emergency that may arise. I believe that I would be derelict in my duty if I do not make an effort to obtain at least as much of an appropriation as the amount named in the department estimates.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

North Platte project, Nebraska-Wyoming: For maintenance, operation, continuation of construction, and incidental operations (including \$800,000 for the Fort Laramie unit), \$1,140,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. My curiosity has been aroused in regard to this item because of the fact that there is a remarkable coincidence in connection with this appropriation in that it includes an item of \$800,000 not originally estimated for by the department, the expenditure to be in the State of Wyoming, represented by the one gentleman on the committee who has a reclamation project in his district. I would like to have him explain how this \$800,000 increase for Wyoming happened to be placed in the bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, it came in a supplemental estimate. When it came in I inquired of the gentleman whether he had gone to the Reclamation Service and insisted on its being sent down, and I told him very bluntly that if the Reclamation Service had been coerced because of his position on the committee to send down an estimate not originally contemplated, I would do everything that I could to prevent an appropriation being made. We were assured, both by the gentleman himself and by the Reclamation Service, that it was purely an oversight. The estimate was \$900,000, and from statements made before the committee we persuaded the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] that that was one of the items in which we could safely reduce the amount recommended, and we reduced the amount from \$900,000 to \$800,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have heard of bargain sales where they mark goods up to \$5 in order to be able to make a cut to \$4.80, when, in fact, the article was worth \$4.50. I did not know but that this might be one of those bargains in the way of an appropriation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I inquired both from the gentleman from Wyoming and those connected with the Reclamation Service, and the assurance was given that the matter was purely an oversight in the submission of estimates, and was not due to the coercive powers of the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have noticed that one of my projects has been cut \$200,000, another project was reduced \$100,000, and other cuts have been made that in all aggregate about \$1,000,000. Now here comes along this increase of \$800,000, which the reductions in the others would provide for.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Nine hundred thousand dollars were estimated for the Fort Laramie unit of the North Platte project, and that would still keep the estimates within the estimated amount in the reclamation fund in the next year.

Mr. HAYDEN. Very easily, because enough is deducted from the other projects to make up that amount.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; without those reductions. The result of the reductions is this, that if the estimates of the revenue are accurate, there will be in the reclamation fund next year \$1,000,000 in excess of what it is proposed to expend; and at the next session of Congress, if any situation should arise where Congress would agree it is imperative that a very considerable sum of money should be provided for some project not provided for, there would not be any fear or doubt as to the availability of the fund to meet the estimate. I think that is an important thing for those interested in the project—to have a situation where they would not have any doubt about getting the means.

Mr. HAYDEN. If this additional appropriation of \$800,000 had not been made for use in Wyoming, we would have that amount of money in addition to be used in case of emergency.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, under date of December 7, the Secretary of the Interior transmitted the estimate referred to. I have his letter, which I will read:

DECEMBER 7, 1914.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

SIR: There is transmitted to you herewith supplemental estimate for the North Platte project to the amount of \$900,000, which sum is estimated to be an imperative necessity for continuing the work on the Fort Laramie unit thereof. This amount is requested as an appropriation in addition to the sum of \$348,000 included in the Book of Estimates for the North Platte project for the fiscal year 1916.

The necessity for submitting such supplemental estimate is that the law requiring such annual estimates to be submitted to the Treasury on or before October 15, was not approved until August 13, 1914, and within the limited time permitted in which to prepare such estimates the status of the Fort Laramie unit could not be accurately determined; therefore no amount was included on account of this unit.

It is now desired to supply this omission by a supplemental estimate to the amount of \$900,000 for expenditure on the Fort Laramie unit of the North Platte project.

It is therefore requested that there shall be submitted to Congress the accompanying supplemental estimate of appropriation required for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, by the Reclamation Service for

the Fort Laramie unit of the North Platte project in Nebraska and Wyoming the sum of \$900,000.

This supplemental estimate has received the approval of the President.

Cordially, yours,

FRANKLIN K. LANE.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Klamath project, Oregon-California: For maintenance, operation, continuation of construction, and incidental operations, \$317,000.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 104, after line 18, by inserting the following paragraph:

"For Oregon projects to be designated by the Secretary of the Interior, \$450,000."

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Chairman, the object of this amendment is to restore the estimate that the Secretary of the Interior made in a supplemental recommendation to the committee. The committee, I understand, rejected this proposal for the reason that no project was designated by the Secretary of the Interior. I informed the Secretary that the committee would disapprove of this recommendation unless he designated the projects on which to expend this money. The Secretary immediately endeavored to have the service designate a project for the expenditure of \$450,000, but he was unable to do this when the committee adjourned its hearings, as his engineers' reports were not finished. He is endeavoring to do that now; he is endeavoring to make a designation in time for the Senate committee to act if Congress insists on a designation. If the Secretary is compelled to make a designation in time for Congress to act, he will necessarily have to confine his designation to certain sections of the State from which he has final reports. This amendment will afford the Secretary ample time to examine the merits of various projects. The State of Oregon has appropriated \$50,000 in one instance and \$15,000 in another for the purpose of investigating the various reclamation projects and possibilities of the State. The Secretary wrote to me that his final reports would be complete some time in June. Now, if he is compelled to designate a project at this time his investigation will be confined to certain sections of the State. I think that his investigation should be permitted to cover the entire State and let him secure the best project obtainable. It is well recognized by everyone who has examined into the distribution of the reclamation fund that the State of Oregon has been grossly discriminated against. No one has recognized that more keenly than the present Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Lane, and he is endeavoring, as far as it lies in his power, to remedy that discrimination and to accord the State its share of the reclamation fund.

Year before last the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Lane, made a trip to Oregon and a trip into the arid sections of the State and publicly and privately he promised the people of Oregon that he would do everything in his power to secure to them a fair and equitable distribution of the reclamation fund. I think the Secretary is doing everything in his power to secure to the State an equitable distribution of the fund which he thinks the State is entitled to, and for that reason he put in this recommendation to the committee. Now, there will be a balance in the reclamation fund after all these appropriations are made of \$1,394,000. The fund will not in any way be embarrassed or handicapped or jeopardized by the small additional allowance of \$450,000 to the State of Oregon to be spent on a project to be hereafter designated by the Secretary of the Interior. The fact that Secretary Lane will have the expenditure of this \$450,000 I think will give the assurance that it will be wisely and economically spent. In addition to that the Secretary himself will not be permitted to expend this \$450,000 until he designates a project which will be approved by the President of the United States, and I think for these reasons that the fund will not be in any way endangered should the committee consent to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes longer.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the committee to the way the reclamation funds have been heretofore expended, and in doing so I do not do it for the purpose of making any invidious comparison between the expenditure of the funds in my State, the allotment of the funds to Oregon, and the allotments which other States have secured, but to show that we are not making an unreasonable request.

Now this present bill appropriates for the State of Arizona \$1,315,000. The State of Arizona has contributed to the reclamation fund \$1,241,696.83. The State of Arizona has heretofore secured from the reclamation fund \$17,608,015.62. The State of Arizona has heretofore secured from the reclamation fund 1,348 per cent of the moneys which she put into the reclamation fund. The State of Colorado secures by this bill \$1,171,000. The State of Colorado has put into the reclamation fund \$6,957,991.83 and has secured from the reclamation fund the sum of \$9,065,688.75. Idaho secures by this bill \$2,060,000. Idaho put into the reclamation fund \$5,212,408.90, and Idaho has heretofore secured \$17,956,894.92. With the fund which Idaho will get by virtue of the present bill it will have secured \$20,000,000 from the reclamation fund, having put therein a little over \$5,000,000. Montana secures by this bill \$2,420,000. Montana put into the reclamation fund \$9,565,107.48 and has heretofore secured \$11,295,788.40. The States of Nebraska and Wyoming secure in this bill \$1,618,000. Nebraska has put into the fund \$1,759,613.83 and Wyoming \$4,522,900.46. Nebraska has heretofore secured \$5,602,377.01 and Wyoming \$7,377,899.38. The State of Washington gets out of this bill \$1,301,000 and it has put in \$6,555,299.73 and has secured heretofore \$9,131,392.97 from this fund. Now the State of Oregon has contributed to the reclamation fund \$10,550,928.22. It has received in gross only \$5,644,530.82, and in that amount of \$5,644,530.82 there is improperly inserted an item of \$450,000 heretofore debited to Oregon cooperation account.

The net investment which the State of Oregon has secured from the reclamation fund is \$3,261,623.22, having contributed thereto \$10,550,928.22. Arizona has secured, according to the April number of the Reclamation Record, 1,348 per cent of the moneys which she put into the reclamation fund; Nevada, 1,067 per cent; Idaho, 327 per cent; Nebraska, 308 per cent; Utah, 166 per cent; Wyoming, 159 per cent; Washington, 137 per cent; Colorado, 128 per cent; Montana, 113 per cent; New Mexico, 110 per cent; Oregon, only 53 per cent; the State of California, 52 per cent; South Dakota, 50 per cent; Kansas, 42 per cent; North Dakota, 19 per cent; and Oklahoma, 3 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes longer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes longer. Is there objection?

Mr. BRYAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I do not object to the gentleman's speaking, but can we not return to that lost art of suggesting a limit of 5 minutes or 10 minutes for debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto? I have not heard that for so long that it would really be refreshing to hear it again.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is no demand for time on this paragraph, as I understand it, except from the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SINNOTT].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. SINNOTT. Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to read to the committee a letter which I received from Secretary Lane of date January 8, 1915, when the Irrigation Committee was considering the reclamation bill, jurisdiction of which was afterwards given to the Appropriation Committee. He writes to me as follows:

HON. NICHOLAS J. SINNOTT,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SINNOTT: The estimates of appropriations for the Reclamation Service for the fiscal year 1916, now being considered by your committee, contain the following item:

"For the Oregon cooperative work, Oregon (conditioned upon appropriation of an equal amount by the State of Oregon), \$450,000."

This department and the State are making an investigation of the possibilities for irrigation in central Oregon through a joint board of engineers, whose final report as to the Deschutes projects should be submitted by the end of this month, but will be delayed until March as to the John Day projects, and until June as to the Malheur and Harney Valley projects.

Now, that is the reason why we would like to have this allotment of \$450,000 in this way at the present time without being compelled to designate a project. The Secretary will not have his surveys and field reports completed on the John Day project until March, and on the Malheur and Harney Valley projects until June. If we do not secure this amount in this bill, the State of Oregon will probably be delayed another year or two before we get further reclamation funds or the Secretary will be restricted in his selection of a project. The Secretary goes on to say:

I realize that these, or more extended investigations, may disclose a situation that would warrant utilizing this appropriation for the de-

velopment of a practicable project, at a reasonable cost per acre, that would materially benefit the State, and am therefore willing that the language which limits the expenditure to a cooperation dependent upon an equal appropriation by the Oregon Legislature be stricken out and the following substituted therefor:

"For Oregon: Projects to be designated by the Secretary of the Interior, \$450,000."

In this form the appropriation would, as I understand it, be available for the carrying out of any new and practicable project in Oregon which could be built within such an appropriation or which could be built by cooperation with the State for such appropriation and the amount contributed by the State.

I will state to the committee that at the present time there is a bill pending before the Oregon Legislature, designed to levy a one-half mill tax on all property in the State for the purpose of securing reclamation funds to cooperate with the Government in reclamation work. The Secretary continues:

It is a matter of great regret to me that the effort to secure cooperation with Oregon along the line of Gov. West's proposal appears to have failed. (I inclose the correspondence on this subject.) It promised the institution of a joint method of using State and Government funds in the development of the West, for it would, I feel sure, have been adopted by other States. I believe that while there is so heavy a demand upon the reclamation fund for the completion of the projects already under way, that it is wisest not to adventure upon new undertakings unless upon a dollar-for-dollar cooperative basis. Nevertheless, I shall raise no objection to the allotment of this amount to Oregon, for I am well convinced that in the past too little consideration has been given to her needs and to the opportunities for development in that State, which I attempted somewhat to remedy by the extension of the Umatilla project and the effort to meet the suggestion as to cooperation in the Deschutes Valley.

Cordially, yours,

FRANKLIN K. LANE.

I desire to add, Mr. Chairman, that the State of Oregon has done what no other State in the Union has done. It has appropriated and expended on reclamation projects the sum of \$450,000 in one instance. It has also appropriated \$50,000 to cooperate with the Government in making surveys, and has made another appropriation for that purpose of \$15,000.

With this history in mind of the interest which Oregon has manifested in the reclamation of arid lands, and the niggardly treatment accorded it in the distribution of the reclamation funds, it seems to me that we are not asking too much when we ask you to approve of the recommendation of Secretary Lane, that Oregon be allotted another item of \$450,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting the table of receipts, allotments, and investments, as found on page 218 of the hearings for the Reclamation Service.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks, as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The table referred to follows.

RECEIPTS, ALLOTMENTS, AND INVESTMENT BY STATES.

The table following gives a statement of additions to the reclamation fund from the sale of public lands, by States, and also shows the amounts allotted and the net investment of the Government for irrigation work in each of the reclamation States:

TABLE 1.—Receipts from the sale of public lands, allotments, and net investment, by States.

States.	Actual receipts from sale of public lands transferred to credit of reclamation fund to June 30, 1914.	Estimated receipts with Treasury United States on June 30, 1914, not yet audited.	Total estimated receipts to June 30, 1914.	Allotments to June 30, 1914.	Net investment to June 30, 1914.
Arizona.....	\$1,165,696.88	\$76,000.00	\$1,241,696.88	\$17,608,015.62	\$15,873,020.83
California.....	5,358,943.03	262,000.00	5,620,943.03	3,048,187.66	2,424,064.45
Colorado.....	6,680,991.93	277,000.00	6,957,991.93	9,065,688.75	6,492,896.66
Idaho.....	5,039,708.90	172,700.00	5,212,408.90	17,956,894.92	14,082,198.37
Kansas.....	963,080.07	12,000.00	975,080.07	419,000.00	376,029.16
Montana.....	8,872,107.48	693,000.00	9,565,107.48	11,295,788.40	7,373,177.47
Nebraska.....	1,664,013.83	95,600.00	1,759,613.83	5,602,377.01	4,319,375.93
Nevada.....	541,596.96	32,000.00	573,596.96	6,290,476.63	5,414,242.44
New Mexico.....	3,939,790.95	177,000.00	4,116,790.95	4,694,409.43	2,862,452.76
North Dakota.....	11,921,898.43	103,500.00	12,025,398.43	2,278,034.14	1,951,020.33
Oklahoma.....	5,783,557.84	29,800.00	5,813,357.84	172,402.22	72,852.87
Oregon.....	10,413,928.22	137,000.00	10,550,928.22	5,644,530.82	3,261,633.22
South Dakota.....	6,823,778.66	175,400.00	6,999,178.66	3,566,534.04	3,142,786.74
Texas.....				2,083,457.60	1,108,529.93
Utah.....	1,890,479.34	49,000.00	1,939,479.34	3,459,877.02	2,388,263.70
Washington.....	6,433,299.73	122,000.00	6,555,299.73	9,131,392.97	6,856,538.59
Wyoming.....	4,320,900.46	202,000.00	4,522,900.46	7,377,890.38	5,790,562.22
Secondary projects.....				121,708.12	
Preliminary investigations.....				511.27	
General accounts.....				392,793.00	122,512.32
Total.....	81,813,772.71	2,616,000.00	84,429,772.71	110,209,956.00	83,912,058.04

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the committee did not recommend this appropriation. To do so would be to initiate a policy which, in my opinion, could not be too severely condemned.

This is a request, in a case where specific appropriations are being made for the first time, to confer upon the Secretary of the Interior blanket authority to designate any project and an appropriation to be expended upon it. The Secretary of the Interior might designate a project that would eventually involve an expenditure of many millions of dollars, and, having commenced it, the excuse would be that having expended half a million dollars on the project we could not justify a discontinuance of the work.

The moneys carried on this bill for reclamation projects are to carry on work on projects already under construction. There has been expended heretofore on reclamation projects \$115,000,000, if my recollection is correct, and it is estimated that these projects will take about \$51,000,000 to complete. It seems unreasonable to ask Congress to appropriate money to be expended on a project unknown at this time to anyone, not designated, not selected, and with no knowledge of what the ultimate expenditure on account of the project might be.

It seems to me that before any money is appropriated for reclamation projects hereafter a project should be definitely designated and accurate information furnished as to the land to be irrigated, a careful estimate made of the cost of the work, a limit placed upon the cost of the project, and then the appropriations made to carry on the work thus authorized. If such a system as that be adopted, it will eliminate much of the criticism of these projects.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I have been informed that the Government has a great deal of land under ditches that are completed, and that it is almost impossible in many instances to dispose of the land that is now under ditches and would be capable of being irrigated—that the Government is unable to find purchasers or persons to take the land. Has the gentleman any information upon that? Have they furnished him any information as to the disposal of land that is already irrigated?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Some projects have not been taken up as rapidly as was anticipated. Some of them, of course, are costing much more than was believed at the outset, but we have projects under construction which will require about \$51,000,000 to complete. It seemed to the committee desirable to dedicate the proceeds of the reclamation fund to the completion of these projects, particularly as the estimates submitted relative to the so-called Oregon cooperative work were for projects to be determined on hereafter, and projects of which it will be impossible to tell how much the eventual cost will be.

I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. FITZGERALD. How much time does the gentleman wish?

Mr. MONDELL. About five minutes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask unanimous consent that the debate on the pending amendment and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the subcommittee on this bill and of the Committee on Appropriations, I would have been very glad, indeed, had I been able to support the estimates proposed by the Secretary for a project in Oregon. I could not do so for various reasons. First, it presented the question of a new project. That in itself was a question that the committee would have considered carefully. Beyond that it raised the question of a new project, the size and character of which no man knew or could suggest. I am sure that my friend from Oregon realizes that this committee could hardly take the responsibility of making an appropriation for a project which we have never seen, a project which we knew nothing about, which might cost ultimately \$1,000,000 or \$10,000,000 or \$20,000,000. We could not afford to take the chances of loading that sort of a project on the reclamation fund.

It is true that Oregon has contributed largely to the fund, and should for that reason be given proper consideration for a project. But Oregon has had more in proportion to what she has contributed than North or South Dakota or Oklahoma. Oregon is only partly an arid State. Half of the State or more is humid and does not need irrigation. Some gentleman reminds me, however, that the entire State has recently gone dry. [Laughter.]

Mr. SINNOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. SINNOTT. I will say that about two-thirds of the State consists of what are called arid lands suitable for irrigation. There are many feasible irrigation projects in Oregon, as I understand it.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not think Oregon has as many feasible projects as some of the other States. Otherwise it would not have taken the Reclamation Service so long to have found a feasible project in Oregon.

Mr. NORTON and Mr. MARTIN rose.

Mr. MONDELL. I am sure that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON] and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN], on either side of me, could suggest a suitable project in either State, offhand, in a moment.

Mr. NORTON. We have several of them.

Mr. SINNOTT. The Director of the Reclamation Service, before your committee, commented upon the great number of feasible projects in the State of Oregon and laid particular stress upon them.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not recall that part of his testimony.

Mr. MARTIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN. In this connection I should like to remind the gentleman that in the State of South Dakota there is a project of such merit that it has had an appropriation from the State legislature, and the State engineering force has surveyed it and gone into all details and has furnished the Secretary of the Interior with a detailed estimate of the number of acres and the cost per acre, and those details have been before the department now for about a year. The State has gone to the expense of several thousand dollars and done this preliminary work, and it is only waiting for the starting of a new project.

Mr. MONDELL. What the gentleman from South Dakota intends to say is that they have discovered a little more water flowing out of Wyoming that is not appropriated, and they are asking for the construction of another reclamation project with that Wyoming water.

Mr. MARTIN. They have little use for water in Wyoming, as I can testify. [Laughter.]

Mr. SINNOTT. In view of the fact that the allotment to the gentleman's State and to Nebraska has been increased nearly \$800,000 more than the original estimates of the Secretary, does the gentleman still object to this little amount of \$450,000?

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman must not base his request for appropriations on misstatements of fact. There have been no increases in the item over what the Secretary originally proposed for that Wyoming-Nebraska project, unless the Secretary himself is in error in the statement he makes in submitting the supplemental estimates when he called attention to the fact that the failure to submit the item in the original estimates was an oversight.

It should be borne in mind that the reclamation fund is rapidly dwindling. We shall have a hard time completing the projects already undertaken. I question if we should undertake any new projects.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SINNOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I would if I had any more time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, if I could bring myself to the viewpoint that is held by most of the gentlemen representing semiarid States, I might find myself more in sympathy with the motion of the gentleman from Oregon. But, unfortunately, to my mind, their position is totally untenable. I do not believe that we can afford to spend reclamation funds on the theory of distributing them between various States without regard to the needs of doing reclamation work in those States. This committee would have been subject to very severe censure if it had undertaken to appropriate a sum without knowing what it was to be expended for or where, other than it was to be expended in a given State. I have taken occasion repeatedly to say on the floor what I desire to now repeat, that I do not think the public lands of America belong to the States in which they happen to be situated. They belong to the people of America and all of the people of America, and the most of the abuse that has grown up regarding the expenditure of this fund has grown up because of the pernicious idea that the people in a particular locality had a special claim or ownership in all the fund that might arise from the sale of public lands in that locality. Hence there has always been a pressure to spend money there, whether it ought to be spent there or not and whether there was any project fit for the spending of the money there.

Speaking for myself, I repeat that if we are going to have this distributed on the theory of the gentlemen from the West, then the gentleman from Oregon has some right to complain. He has a right to feel that the other people have hogged more than their share; but I feel that the National Government can not afford to treat the reclamation fund with any such idea at all.

We ought not to undertake new projects without knowing what they are and what we are going into.

One curious thing about these reclamation projects is that the only project finished happens to be one that has proved an absolute failure. There is one project that has been completed, and it was discovered that the reservoir would not hold water, and no amount of work can make it hold water; and the most of the funds put into the project have been sunk and lost forever.

So I submit in candor to this committee that we can not afford to undertake new projects without knowing what they are, what we are going into, and something about what the expenditure will be.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Does the gentleman allude to the Hondo project?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes. I am sure that whenever the report comes in from the Secretary of the Interior to Congress if there is a project for Oregon it will be dealt with by the committee with the utmost liberality and fairness; but to ask us now to make an appropriation without knowing where it is to be spent and what it is to lead to, or the character of the project, is to ask us to do what no good business man would do in his private affairs and what no good official would do in public affairs.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman tell us how much was spent on the Hondo project?

Mr. SHERLEY. I can not tell the gentleman exactly, but quite a considerable sum; something over \$300,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired; all time has expired.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may have two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent to vacate the order just made and that he may address the committee for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Chairman, I understand that the Secretary at the present time has an Oregon project, the approval of which he is considering, and which has been approved by the Reclamation Service, but that he desires, if possible, to await the final reports on the John Day, Malheur, and Harney Valley projects, which will be completed in June. My amendment will allow him time to consider all these projects. They are all projects that I believe he will approve of.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman will recognize that the Secretary of the Interior has that power now, and that there are \$50,000 appropriated in this bill.

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes; and the State of Oregon has given him \$50,000 to make these surveys.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon.

The question was taken, and the amendment was lost.

The Clerk read as follows:

Belle Fourche project, South Dakota: For maintenance, operation, continuation of construction, and incidental operations, \$144,000.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I was somewhat aroused and interested by the concluding remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY]. I fully agree with him that the money derived from the sale of public lands belongs to all the people of the country, and that it was a mistake to insert in the original reclamation law a provision requiring in a mandatory way that some project be begun in every one of the public-land States regardless of the physical demands of the locality, and that the money should be apportioned between public-land States regardless of the needs of projects under construction. That particular feature of the law which proved so objectionable and unworkable was amended and repealed, as the chairman of the committee has just called to my attention.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. The original act provided that the major part of the money raised from the sale of public lands should be used in that State, but that was repealed by the act of June 25, 1910.

Mr. BORLAND. Then I am right in saying that it was repealed. I have always believed as a western man that the highest value the public lands had to the Nation and to the people of the Nation, including the people of the older States, was to provide for a prompt settlement of these lands by American citizens; that they were not an asset that should be held out of the market to secure a rise in price, but that the minute they got into the hands of a bona fide settler and the settler became a taxpaying, producing citizen that was an asset far greater than any possible advance in any price of the land.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Nothing I have said contravenes that viewpoint at all.

Mr. BORLAND. I got the impression that the gentleman believed that this money belonged to the Nation at large.

Mr. SHERLEY. I think it does.

Mr. BORLAND. And that, therefore, it was not necessarily proper to be appropriated for the development of western land.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am perfectly willing to develop, if we are developing for a national purpose, but whenever you get the idea that the particular public land has impressed upon it a State right as against a national right, then you have an inducement to undertake things that can not be justified from the standpoint of making homes for Americans, or any other good reason.

Mr. BORLAND. I am not sure yet but that there is a fundamental difference of opinion between myself and the gentleman. I believe that the public lands in Colorado or Wyoming or California are of more importance to people of those States than they are to the people of other States, and I believe that their importance consists in getting bona fide tax-paying citizens there at the earliest possible moment, and that is the true development and the true use of the public lands. The question of whether we shall appropriate the proceeds of these lands for particular forms of internal development is a matter for the wisdom of Congress. The question of whether we ought to divide it equally among the States is a comparatively crude way of getting at it, but it is wisely used in the last analysis if it is used for the development of the internal resources of the public-land States. If the plan succeeds, as it is hoped it will succeed, in opening those arid and semiarid lands to settlement and to a tax-paying, producing population, then, in my judgment, that is the highest use that can be made of them. I have objected to starting this proposition out of the public-land fund and then saddling it upon the General Treasury of the Government. I do not believe that ought to be done. I think that the General Treasury of the Government ought not to have been invaded by that alleged \$20,000,000 bond issue that was never made. It was done under the information—misleading information, I believe—given to Congress that the \$20,000,000 bond issue, if authorized by Congress, would complete these projects, and that it would be rapidly paid back by settlements of projects. That expectation could not have been well founded even at the time it was made. I believe we are on the right track in confining these improvements to the fund originally set apart for that purpose. I believe as to that fund no wiser use can be made.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not quarrel with what the gentleman has said, but I can in a moment call his attention to the distinction between the western State view touching public land and the view that I have. It might be highly desirable for the Nation to preserve as national forests certain of its public lands, but you find the States objecting, because, according to their views, it takes away a certain amount of taxable

property, and a certain amount of land which they think could be better used in making homes for people in the State and building up their population. In the determination of that question I believe in the national viewpoint, and that simply what may be to the interest of the State in which the land lies ought not to be the controlling factor.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I believe that primarily public lands—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes more.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MONDELL. I thought the time had all been consumed on this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. No. The committee has disposed of the section on which debate was limited, and this is the following section. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I believe the primary use of public land is to get settlers on it, and if under any view public lands are devoted to some other purpose, national forest or park or otherwise, it ought to be upon some showing that there is an overriding national necessity for withdrawing those lands from the ordinary normal uses of settlement. Right there comes a clear-cut division between the uses for national purposes represented by various services and the use for what might be called State purposes. My view is, and possibly I do not differ from the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] in the last analysis, that the primary and normal purpose of public land is for settlement by citizens, and that any other use of them is an extraordinary use that must be justified by the facts that support it. It may be it is true, and I have no doubt there are cases where land ought to be withdrawn for forest purposes and probably so withdrawn and so withheld from settlement for water-power purposes and national-park purposes and possibly for other purposes that may be discovered and developed, possibly for some mineral-research development that may come about later, but I claim that that is unusual and that the other is usual.

To get back to this proposition, the amount received from public land has, in my judgment, been largely augmented by these reclamation projects. In fact, I doubt if the public lands would have produced as much in the last 10 years if these projects had not been begun. We have almost reached the point where new public lands had stopped selling to bona fide settlers, so we can not say that if those projects were not begun we would have all this money in the Public Treasury. It is very probable that we would not. A great deal of it would have gone into the Public Treasury. Nevertheless it is just as important for the Members of this House from the reclamation States as it is for those from the other States to see to it that the reclamation plans and projects do not become a burden on the Federal Treasury. Their development is, to a certain extent, local in the immediate benefits, and they ought to be confined, and strictly so, to the fund set apart for that purpose.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] is in error somewhat regarding the representations made at the time Congress authorized the \$20,000,000 bonded indebtedness. I was present and took part in those hearings and debates. I was present, I think, at nearly all of them. The claim made at that time was that if \$30,000,000 was allowed a number of the projects would be practically completed, and the Government would that much sooner be in a position of receiving a return of the funds. In fact, they started out to ask for \$40,000,000, but they always felt they were entitled to have \$30,000,000. That was cut down by the House. As I recollect it, the Senate was willing to give us \$30,000,000, but the House cut it to \$20,000,000.

Now, nobody ever claimed \$20,000,000 would complete all the reclamation projects; but it was insisted at the time, and has been ever since, that the \$20,000,000 will be paid back to the Government, every dollar of it. There is no disposition anywhere to have that \$20,000,000 lost to the Treasury of the United States. As a matter of fact, the western projects are going to pay back all of this money and Uncle Sam is not going to lose one dollar of it. The only trouble now is that the overhead charges are becoming so great and the expenses of construction are becoming so high that it is a great burden upon many of the people who are located under those projects. They expected originally to get title to their lands for \$20 or \$30 an acre, while now it is going to cost them \$80 an acre and in some places higher. They are not getting land and money for nothing, as some people apparently imagine.

Mr. CLINE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I will.

Mr. CLINE. Is there any indication when these projects will begin to pay back any money to the Federal Government?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Some of them are repaying the Government now.

Mr. CLINE. Some amounts have already been paid back?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. CLINE. What amount?

Mr. BORLAND. Approximately \$4,000,000 on an investment of over \$90,000,000.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. They are only just beginning to repay the Government. I think they have done pretty well to have already repaid \$4,000,000.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Certainly.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I was one of the western Members who favored changing the law, so that appropriations for this reclamation project should be shown in the estimates annually.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. The gentleman from Colorado, with most of the Representatives from the reclamation States, took a different view of it. Does not the gentleman think if that practice had obtained since we began these projects that these overhead charges and these excessive expenses, that he says are now a burden upon the settler, would have been very much less?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Oh, I think that is true, but I think these excessive charges and the illy considered expenditures are now very largely stopped. I am not complaining of the present management.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. The gentleman does not think that the action of the last session of Congress in requiring these appropriations to be estimated for and made annually is going to injure the development under the Reclamation Service?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No; I do not think so. I do not think it will injure the development. I think the chances are it will have a tendency to improve its efficiency. I was one who did not wish to see the Committee on Appropriations have jurisdiction of it, because I felt that they had so many other things to do they could not give these projects the attention that the Irrigation Committee could; but notwithstanding I am not criticizing that committee's action on this bill at all. A careful supervision of these expenditures is undoubtedly going to work beneficially. But I did not want the impression to get out that we obtained this money under false pretenses, or that we ever said or expected \$20,000,000 to complete 32 projects that are going to cost possibly \$75,000,000.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I will.

Mr. BORLAND. Now, the gentleman says he did not expect \$20,000,000 would complete these projects. Did the gentleman expect \$40,000,000 would complete them?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No; we did not promise that \$40,000,000 would complete them, but it was said that that amount would put them in shape where Uncle Sam would commence getting his money back.

Mr. BORLAND. Then, to go further, long before they could expect to get the \$20,000,000 back, did not they begin a second project in Colorado? Did not the then Secretary of the Interior, after getting the original \$20,000,000—

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No; Secretary Garfield started that project, and Secretary Ballinger was working on that project long before that bond issue. That has been established some 8 or 10 years.

Mr. BORLAND. That is the Grand Valley project. That was not authorized until after the \$20,000,000 had been issued. It was not authorized—

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes; there had been something like \$100,000 spent on it in surveys and otherwise at that time.

Mr. BORLAND. But the fact was the Secretary of the Interior had never authorized a contract until after the \$20,000,000—

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. There had been surveys and locations and other work done—

Mr. BORLAND. The dates will show.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. There have been several surveys made and considerable money spent by the Interior Department.

Mr. BORLAND. That project is a large project—ten or eleven million dollars.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No; not half that much, but a good one. President Taft said it was the best project of all of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

No new drainage system shall be undertaken by the Reclamation Service unless and until valid and binding agreement to repay the cost thereof shall be entered into by a majority of the landowners designated by the Secretary of the Interior as equitably chargeable therewith.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "service," in line 2, page 106, insert:

"On a project or unit on which the construction charge per acre has been fixed and which system shall increase the cost per acre above the sum so fixed."

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the item to which I offer the amendment was inserted with a view of preventing the service from undertaking any new drainage system that would increase the cost of the project above the price fixed. This may be necessary in order that work of this class shall not be undertaken unless it will be reimbursable, but the language as it is in the bill does not clearly indicate the intent of the committee in my opinion. I believe the words I have suggested are necessary to make the intent of the committee clear.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Let me ask the gentleman from Wyoming. Take a case where a project has not been opened and the cost per acre has not been fixed, and there is a controversy as to whether there has not been a determination of the project's cost.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, the gentleman from New York understands that under the law as it is now, under the new legislation, no project will be opened until the price is fixed, and up to the time when the project is opened any lands under the project or the people on the project are subject to whatever charge may be fixed.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is some controversy about that.

Mr. MONDELL. There have been controversies in the past as to whether the price per acre had been fixed, as to whether a project had been opened, as to whether the people had been notified what the price was to be, the people in some cases claiming that it was their understanding that the acre price had been fixed, and the service insisting that any statement made with regard to the construction charge was not the statement which the law contemplated as fixing the price per acre. There can be no question hereafter with regard to that matter, because a project can not be opened until the price has been fixed; and it seems to me that unless we adopt this provision the service could not carry on a drainage project the necessity of which developed during the period of construction or one which might be needed after opening, but would not increase the cost above the construction charge. Unless this language is added to the provision contained in the bill, I do not believe that the provision is workable.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I asked Mr. Davis to prepare a provision for consideration, and pointed out the situation that might exist. I said to him: "There is this question which arises as to whether such restriction should apply to the expenditure on drainage works that have not yet started, and as to whether the same restriction would be wise as to expenditures on work already under construction and on which maybe you have gone too far, and it would be wise to discontinue the scheme that you have started, regardless of whether the money is to be reimbursed or not." The reclamation officers submitted the draft that is in the bill providing that no new drainage system shall be undertaken.

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman will read a little further, he will see that their draft itself contemplates the situation that the language I offer makes clear. It says:

No new drainage system shall be undertaken until valid and binding agreements to pay the cost shall have been entered into by a majority of the landowners.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Now, up to the time they are ready to open the project there is no way in which any such obligation can be accepted by the landowners.

But let me say this to the gentleman from New York: We are all interested in having this paragraph in exactly the form in which it should be. If the gentleman has any doubt about it, I have not. If the gentleman has any doubt about it, I am willing either to withdraw it or to return to the paragraph later and have the matter looked up in the meantime.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Let us pass it over and permit the amendment to be pending.

Mr. MONDELL. Any arrangement of that kind will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am not certain about it. If the gentleman will agree to pass over the paragraph with the amendment pending, I am willing. The purpose was to frame a provision which would prevent settlers upon a project obtaining the benefits of an expenditure for drainage and resisting the reimbursement of the Government for that expenditure.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. That can only occur where the total cost of the project prior to that time has been fixed.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If you gentlemen all agree that this amendment is the one that puts the paragraph in the proper shape, I shall not object.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] makes that clear, and ought to be adopted.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask a question about this. This provides, as it stands, that no new drainage system shall be entered upon unless a majority of the landowners enter into a binding agreement to pay the whole cost. Now, supposing there are a thousand owners and 501 of them enter into an agreement. Does that mean that the 501 have to pay the whole cost?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No. Under the act of last year these questions are submitted to a vote, and the majority can determine what shall bind all the settlers involved. In some of these drainage projects, however, drainage may be necessary on a project, and—

Mr. MANN. I know what is intended, but what I am trying to find out is what is covered by the language of the bill. The bill says that unless a majority enter into a valid and binding agreement to repay the whole cost, you can not enter upon the project. Now, this agreement must be some kind of an agreement—the language here is “a valid and binding agreement”—made by these people. I assume it is made in writing, and the majority will have to sign that agreement, and that majority will have to pay the whole cost. That is what the language says. The gentleman tries to overturn that by referring to the law.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Under the law these matters are submitted to the persons affected. If the majority votes in favor of doing a certain thing, it binds everybody affected.

Mr. MANN. That is the existing law, but that is not this provision. Because that is not efficient or effective sufficiently in the gentleman's opinion he proposes this, which distinctly says that the majority who sign the agreement must agree to pay the whole cost.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Under the existing law—

Mr. MANN. I am merely calling it to the attention of the gentleman. I do not care.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The purpose is to make those affected pay the expense. The Reclamation Service drafted this provision, and said that under its language—

Mr. MANN. The fact that the Reclamation Service drafted it is no sign that it is correct.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They will enforce it in that way.

Mr. MANN. What they wanted to accomplish, I suppose, is that all should pay the cost of it; but what the language means is that the majority shall pay the cost.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It says, “An agreement made by a majority vote of those affected.”

Mr. MANN. If that is the intent, why not say so, instead of saying the other thing?

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman will allow me—

Mr. FITZGERALD. The suggestion of the gentleman has a good deal of merit, and I suggest that we pass the paragraph till to-morrow, and, in the meantime, work out the wording so that it will accomplish what is intended. I ask unanimous consent to pass the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the paragraph, with the pending amendment, be passed until the next meeting of the committee. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I want to say a word in regard to this question of increased cost, because that was one of the features of this new reclamation-extension law.

It was claimed originally as to most of these projects that an advance estimate had been given to the settlers as to how

much the project was going to cost per acre, and that they had capitalized the water users' association upon that basis, and that that was what they were bound for. A controversy of considerable size existed between the settlers and the department on that very question. The department solved that problem in this way: The settlers in many cases wanted additional time on their payments, or they wanted an enlargement of their original projects, and when they came to the department to ask either an extension of time or relief from a default, or an extension, or new work, or any other favor, the department said to them, “Gentlemen, either you must agree to the increased cost over and above what you claim was the limit fixed by the department when the work was begun, or we will not do what you ask.” In that way they compelled the settlers to agree to the real cost instead of the original estimate, which in all cases was too low and in some cases was only 50 per cent of the real cost.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. As soon as I finish this statement. Now, that was the condition before the reclamation-extension law was passed, and the department was actually operating successfully under that system. But along came these gentlemen, and they asked Congress to extend their time by law to 20 annual payments and to relieve them from the first five years' payment.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Because we could not possibly pay it.

Mr. BORLAND. Surely, because they could not pay it; because the projects had in many cases exceeded the original estimate. They asked Congress to pass a law extending the limit of time. Then they asked Congress not only to take away from the department the latitude the department had of compelling them to live up to the real cost, but to say that no new projects or extensions of cost should be added to the cost of construction without the consent of the majority of the water users of the project. Now, that ties the hands of the department in several ways. In the first place, the settlers have got an extension of time. In the second place, they are the absolute masters of the situation as to when new work shall be begun. In that case they failed to say that drainage should be one of the items, and it turns out that in all of the projects no estimate was made for drainage in the original estimate of cost. It was all an afterthought, although they knew that it was a necessary feature of irrigation work and it must be made an integral part of the work. In order to do that under the law that you gentlemen have lately passed, the department must submit it to the majority of the water users to say when they want the drainage done.

Now, I think that the language in this bill ought to remain as it is. It is general language, it is true, but it would be limited by the amendment of the gentleman from Wyoming to a certain case, to wit, the case where the project had been formally opened and definite construction cost fixed. He would strike out and limit the action of the department from applying it to cases where the construction cost by reason of drainage had already exceeded the original estimate, but where no actual proclamation of opening had been made.

Mr. MONDELL. What would the gentleman do? Would he abandon the project?

Mr. BORLAND. The language of the law as it stands is sufficiently broad. It says that the new drainage shall not be begun unless and until a valid agreement is had for its repayment. If the valid agreement is in existence, as the gentleman said, if the original agreement would cover the work up to the time that the construction charge is fixed, then the gentleman's amendment is not needed.

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman will read the item carefully, he will see that the item as it stands will prevent the service from carrying on any one of their projects that they are now carrying on that have not been opened, where they have to do any drainage work. That would be the effect of it, because they are not dealing with the people in the matter of setting prices per acre, and they can not deal with them until they have got the price fixed.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that there has been a unanimous-consent agreement to pass the section until to-morrow, is not this debate out of order?

The CHAIRMAN. Under a strict construction of the rule the Chair would say yes, but the Chair and the committee have been proceeding with great leniency in regard to that rule. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for two minutes, in order to reply to the gentleman from Wyoming.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that his time be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BORLAND. If the department undertook to put in a system of drainage against the opposition of the settlers, even though the project had not been formally opened, they would have the same old dispute with the settlers that they had before, but they would not have the same means of solving that dispute that they had before, to wit, the latitude to accept or refuse an extension of time. We have taken that latitude away from the department, and that was the club by which they settled the disputes of the settlers. They were all asking for an extension of time. The department gave the extension where necessary, but they gave it on such terms as would protect the department. I think the language, broad as it is, is probably needed. If the department recommends any reduction of it, that is another matter.

The Clerk read as follows:

PROTECTION OF LANDS AND PROPERTY IN THE IMPERIAL VALLEY, CAL.

For protecting lands and property in the Imperial Valley and elsewhere along the Colorado River, within the limits of the United States, against injury or destruction by reason of the changes in the channels of the Colorado River, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to expend any portion of such money within the limits of the Republic of Mexico as he may deem proper in accordance with such agreements for the purpose as may be made with the Republic of Mexico, \$100,000, no part of which sum shall be expended until there shall have been paid into the Treasury, by contributions from the Imperial Valley irrigation district, an equivalent amount to the credit of the Secretary of the Interior to constitute with the amount hereby appropriated the total sum of \$200,000, to be expended by him for the purposes herein described.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. Does anyone know what the ultimate cost of this will be?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It may be that it will be necessary to expend at least a million dollars out there, but this is to take care of the immediate situation, and the representative of the settlers in the Imperial Valley stated that if Congress did what they were then requesting there would be no further request. I think the situation, from what I have heard indirectly, is worse than when the matter was before the committee.

Mr. MANN. How much have they already expended?

Mr. FITZGERALD. A million dollars.

Mr. MANN. How much did the Southern Pacific expend that they want the Government to reimburse them for?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think one million and a half.

Mr. MANN. So there is two and a half million dollars up to date. Does the gentleman mean to say that by spending \$100,000 that ends it?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Two hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. MANN. That is drawing on the imagination a long ways.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not think that this will permanently care for the situation, but this is to carry it past the great danger that threatens from floods this spring.

Mr. MANN. And probably next year they will need the same amount.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. In the statement that was made it was said that this would carry it along at least 10 years.

Mr. MANN. Who makes the statement? They send one man here one year and the next year they send another man, and he is not bound by what the first one said.

Mr. KETTNER. The statement was made by one of the commissioners of the irrigation district. The people of the Imperial Valley voted \$3,500,000 to buy this irrigation system from what they term the C. D. Co., which was formerly owned by the Southern Pacific.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is reelected to the next House. Is he willing to say that he will not come and ask Congress to make any further appropriation while he is a Member of the House?

Mr. KETTNER. Why, Mr. Chairman, I would not like to make a statement of that kind.

Mr. MANN. I wondered if anybody would really get pinned down on it except some gentleman who is not going to be here next year.

Mr. KETTNER. The gentleman will admit that the people of the Imperial Valley are making progress. They have voted, as I say, \$3,500,000 to buy this system.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from California knows all the circumstances; I do not. It was stated that \$100,000 was all that would be asked of the Government for 10 years. Is the gentleman willing to make that statement?

Mr. KETTNER. No; I am not willing to make the statement for this reason—

Mr. MANN. The gentleman does not have to give any reason. [Laughter.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. That statement was not made to the committee. They said if we gave them \$250,000 they would not ask for any more.

Mr. MANN. It is perfectly evident to my mind that any promises made that they would not ask for any more were Indian gifts and are to be withdrawn, or made with the fingers crossed. I want to ask the gentleman who in the Republic of Mexico now can give consent to this.

Mr. KETTNER. The Department of the Interior spent \$50,000 last year on this same project in the Republic of Mexico, and the conditions are the same now as they were a year ago.

Mr. MANN. In Mexico? Not at all.

Mr. KETTNER. In fact, they are better now.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; they are much worse in Mexico.

Mr. KETTNER. Not in the Imperial Valley in Lower California.

Mr. MANN. No one knows now among the numerous governments in Mexico who has charge. I say no one; the gentleman may know; and if he does, will he tell us who will we deal with in the Republic of Mexico in reference to this matter?

Mr. KETTNER. The people of the Imperial Valley now are dealing with Gen. Villa. He has his governor appointed in Lower California. At the present time the people are dealing with him.

Mr. MANN. But Villa has not been acting as President more than 10 days.

Mr. KETTNER. He has had his governor there for some time.

Mr. MANN. Whom do you mean by "his governor"?

Mr. KETTNER. The man he appointed as governor.

Mr. MANN. But he has not been President but a short time.

Mr. KETTNER. He has taken that liberty, however.

Mr. MANN. Plainly that is not the Government of Mexico.

Mr. KETTNER. He is the only governor there is authorized in that section.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] propounds a very important interrogatory as to how much we will probably be called upon to spend in the future for the protection of Imperial Valley, and the gentleman from California [Mr. KETTNER] and others, individually and collectively, decline to make any promises. I do not blame them for refusing to make promises, but I think that the gentleman from California should not hereafter call upon the Federal Government to appropriate funds for the protection of the Imperial Valley. I feel very kindly toward the people of the Imperial Valley and southern California and think we should be very liberal with them; but I think they ought to understand that this is about all that Uncle Sam ought to be expected to do for them. So far as their trouble with the overflow of Volcano Lake is concerned, it is not a matter that directly concerns anybody but the people of the Imperial Valley.

There is, however, a real menace, the possibility of a break in the river in its upper reaches, the 8 miles below the head-gate of the Imperial Canal, the possibility of its again breaking and running over into the Alamo, which is now used as the canal for the Imperial Valley Irrigation Works. Most of this hundred thousand dollars, I presume, will be expended in cooperation between the people of the Imperial Valley and the Government, although, of course, the Secretary of the Interior will use his judgment in the matter in strengthening the levees on the upper river. The care and the protection of the Imperial Valley from the overflow of Volcano Lake should be provided for entirely, I think, by the people of the Imperial Valley, and if \$200,000 are expended on the upper river to strengthen the levees and to prevent the danger of the river again breaking through into the Alamo and into the Imperial Valley Canal I think it ought to put that work in such shape that we will not be called upon again to contribute anything in the future. After the expenditure of the sum herein provided for, I think the people of the Imperial Valley should take care of the river as it affects their valley.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 106, line 16, after the sum "\$100,000," strike out all of line 16 and insert in lieu thereof the words "which sum shall be available for expenditure as soon as."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. The Clerk read as follows:

ALASKA, EXPENSES IN.

Alaska Engineering Commission: For carrying out the provisions of the act approved March 12, 1914 (38 Stats., 305), entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," to continue available until expended, \$2,000,000.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out, on page 107, lines 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to raise the question of the Alaskan Railway at this time. That is legislation. The Alaskan Railway will be built. I have opposed the Alaskan Railway, and I am still opposed to it, but the bill is now law and the road will be built. There is no reason for haste in making this appropriation now. The time is not propitious to begin the construction. One million dollars was appropriated when this bill was passed last March, and only one-third of that amount has been expended. There is near \$700,000 of that amount available for present demands. Congress will meet in regular session in December. The amount already appropriated will pay expenses of locating the proposed route. In the meantime we hope to see the Treasury replenished. There is no reason or justice in appropriating \$2,000,000 at this time, when the Treasury is depleted and a special stamp tax is being collected to meet the necessary running expenses of the Government. When this bill was passed the Treasury was overflowing with money and no war clouds threatened the peace of the world. When the money already appropriated is exhausted there is no reason why the work should not be abandoned until taxes can be collected in the usual way and the peace of the world restored. The whole country is depressed. It is bleeding at every pore—North, South, East, and West—on account of the European war. [Laughter on the Republican side.] Oh, gentlemen on the Republican side know the reason for the depressed condition of the country, and it is perfectly silly for anyone to say that the European war is not causing it. How about Democratic prosperity before the European war? You can not convince the intelligent voter that the Democratic administration caused this depression.

Mr. FALCONER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIBBLE. Yes.

Mr. FALCONER. Does not the gentleman know that Alaska in the next six months will send probably ten or twelve million dollars of gold into the United States?

Mr. TRIBBLE. How much has it ever sent here?

Mr. FALCONER. From seventeen to twenty million dollars per annum.

Mr. TRIBBLE. And how will this railway aid in the sending of gold into the United States?

Mr. FALCONER. It will increase it greatly. When the railroad is completed and developed it will send probably fifty or sixty million dollars into the United States.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I stated in the beginning of my remarks that I did not care to raise the question of the benefits resulting from the Alaskan Railway and the objections to Government construction and ownership. I raise the question now of the propriety of appropriating \$2,000,000 at this time. There could not be a more inappropriate time. My motion is to strike the \$2,000,000 from the bill. I am informed that this money is wanted for the purpose of purchasing certain railroads in Alaska owned by corporations and, I am informed, operated at great loss. I would like to know from the chairman of this committee why it is that two millions is asked for now, when not a plow has been put into the ground to build a railroad, not a shovel has been purchased, and nothing has been done. That is no small amount of money, and I would like to hear from the chairman of this committee why it is asked for now.

Mr. MADDEN. How is this commission that has been appointed going to pay its expenses if it does not get the \$2,000,000?

Mr. TRIBBLE. What expenses have they?

Mr. MADDEN. That is all there is to the commission.

Mr. TRIBBLE. They had a million dollars, and they have used one-third of that amount already, and two-thirds of a million dollars should certainly pay the engineers in Alaska who are locating the railroad until this Congress meets in December.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman does not understand, evidently, the extravagant waste of money that this commission indulged in, or he would not say that.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I am sure there is great extravagance in the use of money there, and that is one of the reasons I am objecting to this, and I thank the gentleman for the suggestion.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield to the gentleman from California?

Mr. TRIBBLE. I am asking the gentleman from New York a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, \$1,000,000 was appropriated in the act authorizing the construction of railroads in Alaska. That act authorized the appointment of a commission. That commission went to Alaska, and has made very extensive surveys and examinations of properties, and is now preparing its report. It expended \$378,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I understood the Delegate from Alaska to say when the bill was up for consideration in the last session of Congress that all of the surveys had been made, and all the commission would have to do would be to select the route.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Then he did not know what he was talking about, because this commission has made a survey.

Mr. WICKERSHAM rose.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, I did not mean to be offensive in that statement. I think that perhaps there must be some misunderstanding.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I did not make any such statement.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This commission has made a survey of the route over which it is believed nobody has ever passed at all, and they are now preparing their report. When the report is submitted to the President, the President must first locate the route, and after the route is located, if it be from points where there are existing railroads, or where existing railroads can be utilized, he must determine whether an attempt will be made to purchase any of the existing railroads.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask that my time be extended.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Now—

Mr. TRIBBLE. I want to ask the gentleman this question: What is the necessity, until this commission makes a report, for according to the gentleman's statement only one-fourth of the money—I was in error when I said one-half—

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the gentleman will let me proceed for a moment or two—

Mr. TRIBBLE. This is in my time, and I am asking the gentleman a question.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I understand; but I will answer the question. The statement I make I think will answer the gentleman's question. It is expected that in the immediate future the President will determine the route to be selected. This money is necessary, because as soon as the route is selected, whether it is proposed to purchase a road or not, it is designed to utilize the coming season for construction purposes. If it is determined to purchase an existing road, it is desired to have sufficient money to make a substantial payment on account of the purchase. There seems to exist good reasons, if one of these roads is to be purchased, to attempt to complete the purchase at this time—

Mr. TRIBBLE. Does not the gentleman think it would be better for this Congress to wait until the commission reports?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; I do not.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Let them make their report to this Congress, and if they say it is desirable to buy a certain railroad in Alaska, let this Congress pass upon the question of whether it proposes to buy a Guggenheim, Morgan, or any other road in Alaska.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; I do not think that at all, because this Congress, after a very full, deliberate, and extensive consideration of that question, determined that it would place the power and responsibility upon the President of the United States. I was not in favor of the construction of railroads in Alaska. I am acquiescing in what Congress determined, and I think it the part of wisdom, from the information that I have been able to obtain, that so long as Congress has determined to construct this road, to comply with the request of the Secretary of the Interior and appropriate this money at this time.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I want to ask the gentleman if it was not frequently stated on the floor of this House that it was not proposed to buy these railroads, but this money was to be appropriated to build railroads?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think it was stated that the purpose of passing the bill to authorize the construction of railroads in Alaska was not primarily designed to purchase any railroad, but the bill as worked out provided that the President should select a route of a proposed Government road. If it were ascertained that the route selected was one where an existing road could be utilized, the President was authorized to purchase the road, but was limited in the price to be paid to the appraised value of the road determined by the Government commission. Now, it depends on whether the route selected be one side or the other of Prince William Sound.

If it be one or the other, after whichever side is selected, they were to proceed to build the road to Fairbanks first. Then, whether it is desired to utilize as part of the system to be constructed either the Alaska Northern or the Copper River road, if it was decided that it would be the part of wisdom to attempt to utilize either one of those existing roads, it would be necessary to ascertain whether the road could be purchased within the terms specified in the law. Now, the information is that the Department of the Interior will be prepared at the end of the season, this coming working season, the summer months, to proceed upon a route which will be selected with this construction work. It may be necessary or desirable to attempt to purchase an existing road and to make payment on it. My own belief is that since this work has been authorized, and since in fact it has taken from private enterprise all incentive to build railroads in Alaska, that the United States should proceed to do what is contemplated by the law as rapidly as can reasonably be expected, or else it should repeal the law, so that private enterprise may have the opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask for one minute.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman's time be extended.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, all I care to say is that the time is not propitious to continue this work in Alaska and there are about three-quarters of a million dollars unexpended. I assert that this money is being appropriated for the purpose of buying railroads in Alaska, and I say this is no time to appropriate to buy railroads in Alaska or anywhere else. Who wants to sell a railroad, and why this haste? These are questions that Congress should investigate before taking money raised by stamp tax, when the people are suffering in this period of financial distress. I appeal to you to keep this money at home for the comforts of our suffering people. I stand ready to appropriate money to furnish means of transportation of our corn, cotton, wheat, and other agricultural and commercial products, thus helping to relieve the congestion of the country, but I can not sit without protest and see \$2,000,000 spent in Alaska when it is so badly needed at home.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the paragraph in order to perfect it. I move to strike out the figure "2" and insert the figure "1," so as to make it read "\$1,000,000" instead of "\$2,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 107, line 11, by striking out "\$2,000,000" and inserting "\$1,000,000."

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt now, and I had none when the bill was before the House providing an appropriation for the construction of a Government-owned railroad in the Territory of Alaska, that existing railroads constructed there would be taken over by the Government, and if I could have had any doubt at that time all doubt of that has been removed by this time.

It was charged repeatedly when that bill was under discussion that certain parties opposing the enactment of the bill were favoring certain individuals who owned railroads up in that country. That was not the fact. They were opposing it because they did not think the condition of the Government funds in the Treasury at that time would justify such an appropriation. But since that time and within the last four weeks the representatives of the men who own those railroads have been to the Department of the Interior and to the executive branch of the Government, to get them to take over their roads, and all that you need to do is to examine the testimony contained in the supplemental hearings, which I shall ask leave, before I conclude, to put in the Record in connection with my remarks.

In the testimony of the Secretary of the Interior he mentions proposed construction in one word and devotes two pages to a discussion about taking over the Copper River Valley road and the Alaskan Northern, one or other other. He says that

one or the other of those two routes should be selected. Of course we know that when it comes to that proposition they are not going up there to parallel one of those roads already constructed. Whether you write it in the bill or not, it remains true, nevertheless, that these engineers will in all probability recommend that it will be better to take over the Copper River Valley road or the Alaska Northern than it would be to undertake to construct a parallel line, for the reason that the men owning those roads will probably offer the Government such a proposition that the Government can more cheaply buy than to construct a road to parallel them and take chances in the future of making anything out of the investment.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. DAVENPORT. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. Would it not be good business if the Government could buy an existing road, or a portion of a road, rather than to build another? Would not that be practical business judgment?

Mr. DAVENPORT. I should think it would, but I think when we start in with an appropriation for that purpose we ought to say that that is what we are going to do, and not beat about the bush in order to relieve those men of something that they can not get rid of otherwise.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield to the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. DAVENPORT. Yes.

Mr. BRYAN. If we put in these words to buy the roads up there, we would thereby give those parties such an advantage that they could charge any price they wanted and would not that defeat the object of the legislation?

Mr. DAVENPORT. I did not say write it in the bill; but if it were written on the face of the bill it would not stand out more clearly to the American people than it did when the bill was drawn. We knew then that that was what was intended. Mr. Lane, the Secretary of the Interior, says they will buy if satisfactory arrangements can be made to take over one or the other of these routes.

Mr. FALCONER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield to the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. DAVENPORT. I do.

Mr. FALCONER. Can the gentleman tell us whether it is the intention of the administration to take over and buy one or the other of these railroads?

Mr. DAVENPORT. I did not say so.

Mr. FALCONER. The gentleman said, and the previous speaker said, that the object of this was to buy railroads.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I said the object was, according to the testimony of Secretary Lane, to do one or the other. When the President had selected the route he would follow from the coast to Fairbanks they would buy one or the other of the railroads. That was in the supplementary hearing. In the first hearing Secretary Lane did not know whether or not they would submit an estimate of an appropriation, but subsequently, when I saw Mr. Kenzey and others at the White House, the proposition of an appropriation of \$2,000,000 was included in the bill, and to carry it out Mr. Lane says if they reach an agreement with reference to buying—

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVENPORT. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman does not mean to say that if the Government should buy one of these roads that would be all the development in the way of building railroads in Alaska that was contemplated by the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. DAVENPORT. No.

Mr. GOOD. That would be practically the beginning of the project that would be undertaken, as I understand it.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I understand it this way: I do not mean to say they would not build any more. I think, possibly, if they buy the Copper River Railroad, which is the one that will be bought when the contract is made because it has the best harbor, as I think, they will probably extend the line to Fairbanks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, pending that request, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I desire some time.

Mr. MADDEN. Make it an hour. This is a very important matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending paragraph and amendments thereto close in 25 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, there is a strong demand over here for at least 25 minutes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, they do not all want to talk. I heard some men who said they wanted to talk complaining about the amount of time that had been used here to-day.

Mr. MANN. Well, I want to have five minutes myself, although my request did not provide for it. I think we ought to push this bill along. I think we ought to stay here this evening and push it along.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, I hope the House will stay here to-night. We will say 45 minutes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MANN. Will that give 25 over here?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not know. I guess not. Well, make it 50 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Well, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] wants five minutes, and the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. WICKERSHAM] wants five, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FALCONER]. I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph, and all amendments thereto, close in 50 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Connecticut rise?

Mr. DONOVAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I would like to get a little information from the chairman of the committee as to why there is so much interest all at once in the debate on this proposition? [Laughter.] We have been going along heretofore in free-and-easy style. Why can you not let your associates in?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I can explain to the gentleman, I think.

Mr. DONOVAN. I hope you can.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This is a proposal whereby the committee recommends that \$2,000,000 be appropriated toward carrying on the work of constructing railroads in Alaska. One element in the House—and I think a large one—believes in prosecuting the work. Other Members in the House believe it would be advisable not to build them at all. Another element thinks it advisable to defer the building. The amount is \$2,000,000. It is a large sum, and the matter is a very important one. That is why I am attempting now to get a limit on the debate, before Members get warmed up and want several hours on it.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the gentleman's answer is responsive.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is intended to be.

Mr. DONOVAN. I want to find out what is the reason for this? When we have been lagging and playing along, and things have been going in a haphazard way, what has happened all at once?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman has just come in. He has not been present; that is all.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I say to the gentleman that this bill has progressed much more rapidly than it has been accustomed to progress ordinarily.

Mr. DONOVAN. I wish the gentleman from Georgia had kept his seat, because he always has too much influence with me, and I feel impelled now to take my seat. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. Reserving the right to object, I do not care to object, but I want to know of the chairman of the committee if it is his intention to remain in session beyond the consideration of this item to-night?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; I hope we may stay here for some time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. I can not be here all the afternoon, and there is an item on page 111 in which I am interested.

Mr. FITZGERALD. What is the item?

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. Platt National Park in Oklahoma.

Mr. FITZGERALD. You get everything you want there.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. If there is to be no objection to that item, I will make no objection now.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There will not be any trouble about that item. If any attempt is made to strike out the item in the absence of the gentleman, I will ask to have the item passed over until to-morrow.

Mr. MANN. I think the Platt National Park item will go through this year without any trouble.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That item is safe.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the debate on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed in 50 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DAVENPORT].

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Chairman, I was about to answer the gentleman from Iowa. I know that the railroad is going to be constructed, and I think it is to be constructed as far as Fairbanks, but I do not think there is any necessity at present for so large an appropriation as is contained in this paragraph. If it becomes necessary to purchase either one of the roads—and, as I said a while ago, I am quite sure they will purchase one or the other—they certainly can make an arrangement with the gentlemen who now own these roads, who can not make anything out of them and can not operate them so as to pay running expenses, by which arrangement the President can pay them a sum to hold the trade and bind the bargain, and then wait until it can be reported to Congress what is to be the purchase price of the road, or what the road can be acquired for.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DAVENPORT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SHERWOOD. How long is that road?

Mr. DAVENPORT. There is one road 196 miles long. That is the Copper River Valley road. The other, the Alaska Northern, is 71 miles long, of which 30 miles are in operation, if I remember correctly. As it is conceded by a great many of the departmental officers that the finances of the country are not in the very best condition at present, I think that \$1,000,000 is certainly sufficient to continue the engineering investigation up there, and to make a contract with either of those corporations for the purchase of their road. There is more than half a million dollars of the original appropriation unexpended, and that, with the appropriation of \$1,000,000, will give a million and a half to be expended this year in the few months that they can operate up there. We have not got the reports. We do not know what the engineers' reports show. We have no reports whatever, and I find none in the hearings containing anything to show for what sum they may be able to purchase either of the roads. If there has been any proposition submitted, I fail to find it in the hearings, although it may be there. So I say, until we have ascertained what the cost of acquiring the road will be an appropriation of \$1,000,000 now in addition to what is already available will certainly be sufficient to carry on the work for the next few months.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Are those roads paying now?

Mr. DAVENPORT. I will say to the gentleman from Ohio that I do not know, but I know that the hearings on the original bill disclosed that the road 71 miles long was being operated, as they used to say, tri-weekly, for 30 miles. That is, they would run a train up one week and try to get back the next. [Laughter.] The other one is being operated by the owners of the Bonanza mine, and I suppose it is hauling freight, if there is any to haul along the line.

Mr. FOWLER and Mr. LEVY rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. DAVENPORT. I will yield first to the gentleman from Illinois, and then to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FOWLER. I am anxious to know who are the owners of these two roads?

Mr. DAVENPORT. The Morgan interest and the Guggenheims own the Copper River road; and the other line, if I recollect aright, is owned by a man named Belaine, or some such name as that, or at least he is largely interested.

Mr. LEVY. Is it no more important to appropriate this money for Alaska than to appropriate the \$3,000,000 for the physical valuation of railroads in the United States—

Mr. DAVENPORT. I think not.

Mr. LEVY. When we have taken \$550,000,000 out of Alaska in minerals and other products, with no internal improvements made by the Government?

Mr. DAVENPORT. I do not know that we have taken out \$550,000,000 yet. The greater part of the minerals that have been shipped out of Alaska have come from the seaboard, from the coast, and very little of it, except from the Bonanza mine,

owned by the Guggenheims, and some other smaller mines and carried over the trail, have come from the interior.

Mr. LEVY. But already \$550,000,000 have been taken out of Alaska.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I can not say how much, but minerals to quite a large amount and value have been taken out of Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. It is contemplated, is it not, to buy one of these railroads, and how far would \$2,000,000 go toward buying a railroad at \$40,000 a mile?

Mr. DAVENPORT. That is the point I am making; until we find out what we can purchase them for, there is no need of making any appropriation.

Mr. BOOHER. As I recall, Congress has nothing to do with the price of the road. The President fixes the price of the road and makes the contract.

Mr. DAVENPORT. That is correct.

Mr. BOOHER. Then, why should we wait any longer for a report to Congress?

Mr. DAVENPORT. Because the President always does, and will when he makes a deal, make a report to Congress and ask for an appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to make this statement. Debate, by order of the committee, is limited to 50 minutes. The Chair has requests from 10 Members for that time. If an extension is granted to any speaker, others will necessarily be cut out. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that his time be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, in view of the situation, I object.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate the testimony of Secretary Lane given in the supplemental hearings on the sundry civil bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The following is the testimony:

FEBRUARY 1, 1915.

ALASKAN RAILROADS.

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANKLIN K. LANE, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

The CHAIRMAN. We have before us, Mr. Secretary, an estimate just transmitted for the construction and operation of railroads in Alaska. It is to be used for carrying out the provisions of the act approved March 12, 1914 (38 Stats., 305), entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," the additional sum of \$2,000,000 to continue available until expended. In the act providing for the construction of railroads in Alaska \$1,000,000 was appropriated?

Secretary LANE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You are now asking for \$2,000,000. Will you state the situation, please?

Secretary LANE. We have about half of that million dollars left, and we have asked for \$2,000,000 more, so that we may begin construction this spring. The President has not decided on which side of Prince William Sound the road should run. We have not, in fact, got the completed report, nor any report in writing from the engineering commission as yet, but they have consulted with the President and advised with him as to the condition of the roads that exist up there and the nature of the routes and the approximate cost of the road that is proposed from the coast to Fairbanks and the interior. Of course there can not be anything done toward the purchase of any of the roads there, either the road running from Seward north, called the Alaskan Northern, or from Cordova up to Chitina, called the Coper River & Northwestern, until the President decides which route to follow. I suppose as soon as that report is made by the engineering commission to him he will decide what route is best to follow. Then the probability is we will take up at once negotiations, if he thinks it is advisable, for the purchase of one of those roads.

The CHAIRMAN. It is proposed to build a road from one side or the other of Prince William Sound to Fairbanks?

Secretary LANE. That is the main trunk line.

Mr. GILLET. How much did you say that would cost?

Secretary LANE. Of course, if we bought the Cordova road it would depend upon the terms we could get, and that is also true of the Alaskan Northern, which runs for 71 miles. The road outside of that would probably cost an average of over \$40,000 a mile, somewhere between \$40,000 and \$50,000 a mile. From Chitina on to Fairbanks it would run in a country where construction would probably be cheaper, but where there is very little land available for agricultural purposes for the first 100 miles.

Mr. MONDELL. Are you still considering, Mr. Secretary, the possibility of entirely new construction?

Secretary LANE. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. I mean new construction for the entire distance.

Secretary LANE. For the entire distance; yes. There is one new route from Portage Bay. Portage Bay is about opposite Valdez on Prince William Sound. It is one of those little inlets from the sound itself. Portage Bay is cut off from Turnagain Arm by two large mountains, and Turnagain Arm runs into Cooks Inlet. There is a very practicable harbor at Portage Bay that it would be necessary to tunnel to, and those tunnels would probably amount to a total of approximately 3 miles, or perhaps 3½ miles. We have got figures made on them. Then we would run up on the north side of Turnagain Arm through the Susitna Valley, then across Broad Pass down through the Tanana Val-

ley to the Tanana River, and across the Tanana River to Fairbanks. That is a road that would be entirely new.

Mr. SHERLEY. What distance would that be?

Secretary LANE. About 418 miles. There is not very much difference in any of these routes.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the distance to Fairbanks?

Secretary LANE. Yes. Then, on the same side you could take Seward as your terminus instead of Portage Bay and run up approximately 60 miles to Turnagain Arm, and from there on by the same route.

Mr. MONDELL. In that event you would utilize part of the—

Secretary LANE (interposing). We would then utilize part of the Alaskan Northern road, which is now being operated about 30 miles out of Seward, but which was constructed a full 71 miles. That runs for a short distance on the north side of Turnagain Arm, but the road itself is not operated the full distance.

Mr. MONDELL. As an alternative have you also had under consideration the proposition of building to the Bering River field in order to utilize those coals without deciding fully as to your main-line construction?

Secretary LANE. Yes; there is a proposition that has been considered in the past, and was reported on by the old railroad commission of which Mr. Brooks was a member—which reported two years and a half ago—for building from the Bering River coal field down to Controller Bay, a distance of about 26 miles. That route was, I believe, originally outlined by a man named Richard Ryan, who was in to see me the other day about it. He thinks that by building a branch from the Copper River road at mile 40, extending it over a distance of about 60 miles to the Bering River field, and then from the Bering River field down to Controller Bay, he would be able to get all of the copper ore that originates on the Copper River road smelted on the Bering River coal fields themselves; put up a smelter there where the coal is or else down at Controller Bay. The estimate of the old commission for protecting a harbor at Controller Bay was about \$2,000,000, because it would be necessary to build a breakwater and make Controller Bay into a practicable harbor, and I just state the figure from recollection; but he thinks it could be done for \$800,000, and has presented a proposition to which he wants us to give consideration—that instead of our going into the Bering River field some permit or right be given him to go in there and make that connection. I suppose that it is a possibility that Mr. Morgan, if he retains the Copper River road, would want also to drive over from his road to Bering River field and tap that for purposes of coking coal, and perhaps he would put up his smelter at the junction of the two roads or else down at Cordova.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the act a commission was appointed?

Secretary LANE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you state the names of the members of the commission?

Secretary LANE. Mr. William C. Edes, who for the last 25 years was engaged in locating roads for the Southern Pacific, Central Pacific, and the Santa Fe; Lieut. Mears, who was the general superintendent of the Panama road.

The CHAIRMAN. And built the relocated line?

Secretary LANE. Yes; and Mr. Riggs, who surveyed the boundary line between Canada and Alaska.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you recall when they were appointed?

Secretary LANE. I think they were appointed about the last part of April.

The CHAIRMAN. Of last year?

Secretary LANE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And you say they have gone to Alaska and surveyed these two routes on each side of Prince William Sound?

Secretary LANE. I can tell you in some detail what they have done, if you care to hear it.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that would be interesting.

Secretary LANE. They made an appraisalment of the Alaska Northern road.

Mr. SHERLEY. Have we a map of Alaska here?

Secretary LANE. I think I can give you a rough outline of the situation. This is supposed to represent Prince William Sound, and this is Cordova, and here is the present Copper River & Northwestern road, which goes up to a place called Chitina and turns on down south [indicating].

The CHAIRMAN. Is that what is called the Morgan road?

Secretary LANE. That is commonly called the Morgan-Guggenheim road. This is Seward, and up here runs the Alaska Northern. That is the road that Mr. Ballaine was interested in originally, and that runs up to mile 71. Here is Portage Bay, and this is Turnagain Arm, and this is Cooks Inlet, and this is the Pacific Ocean here [indicating].

Mr. GILLET. Why should they have run that railroad up there [indicating]? Is not this deep water?

Secretary LANE. Yes; that is deep water, but there is a mountain range, and it would require 3½ miles of tunnel to get to Portage Bay, and besides there is very good territory in here with a lot of small gold properties and a considerable amount of agricultural land in small valleys.

The commission divided itself in this way: Mr. Edes went to a point here called Ship Creek, at the head of Cook Inlet. He then surveyed this route down to Portage Bay. He surveyed this route and also a relocation of the road down to Seward and made an appraisalment of that road. He also went from Ship Creek up to the head of Matanuska Valley, where the coal fields are, a distance of about 75 miles. Then Mr. Mears went from that junction point, at the mouth of the Matanuska Valley, up through the Susitna Valley to Broad Pass. There he was met by Mr. Riggs, who had come down the Yukon River and had made his headquarters at Fairbanks, and at Fairbanks he surveyed the route from Fairbanks over to Broad Pass. They met there and went over the route that Riggs had already surveyed and attempted relocations. Right here are the Great Nenana coal fields, to the north of Broad Pass, a great field of lignite, where they have veins exposed for 40 or 50 feet; a perfectly marvelous thing. It is a good grade of lignite. It will last under exposure for perhaps 30 days.

If they could do here as they do over on the border line between Alaska and Canada—transform the coal into power at the mine—they could use it most profitably. They attempted to mine that lignite and transport it down the Yukon Valley and found that to be a failure, because the coal would slack in a very short time after exposure; so they have to put up the power plant right at the mine and use the coal as soon as it is taken out, and transport the power to Dawson and all of the mining field around there, and that is a very practical scheme, and it is being done to some extent at the Pennsylvania field now for supplying some of the Pennsylvania cities with power instead of transporting the coal.

After Riggs and Mears got to Fairbanks they came down over this route to Chitina, making a reconnaissance survey over this line that had already been surveyed by the commission of two years ago. Then they

went down over the Copper River road to Cordova, then across over to Seward, and came up over this line again and made an appraisalment with Mr. Edes, of the Alaska Northern, and an estimate of the cost of the Portage Bay project. The commission also sent a company of men through the Susitna Valley and through the Alaskan range on the west side of the Susitna Valley over into the Kuskokwim and Iditarod country, which lies to the west of the Susitna Valley about 350 miles. They found a new pass. A reconnaissance survey had been made of that route two years ago, or a partial survey, and it was found that a very heavy grade was the best that could be done. Our party found a new canyon and a new route which made a practicable grade from Susitna Valley over to the headwaters of the Kuskokwim.

The CHAIRMAN. Some of the most valuable land is supposed to be in the Kuskokwim.

Secretary LANE. They do not know about the agricultural land, because that has not been developed much.

The CHAIRMAN. I thought it had been.

Secretary LANE. No; there has been very little done in an agricultural way there, but there are, I believe, some gold placers and two or three small quartz properties.

The commission then had an agricultural survey made of all the lands in the Susitna Valley, of the lands at the headwaters of the Kuskokwim, of the lands around Fairbanks and in the Tanana Valley, and the lands in the Chitina Valley.

In addition, they ran a line from the Chitina Valley at a place called Copper Center westward down into the Matanuska field, so as to see what kind of a grade they could get from the Matanuska coal field eastward to this Copper River road if it were extended up to Fairbanks. They made a reconnaissance survey also out of Valdez over what is called the Richardson road, which is a Government road, to see what kind of grades they could get passing over the range there, and from a point on that road southward through a subsidiary stream down to the Copper River to see if it were possible to get an easier and better and cheaper route to maintain than the present Copper River road, so that it would go something like this [indicating] northward from Copper River and then down into Valdez.

The CHAIRMAN. You speak of the Richardson road—is that the road built by Col. Richardson?

Secretary LANE. Yes, sir; by the United States Government. That road extends all the way from Valdez to Fairbanks.

Mr. GILLETTE. That is a highway?

Secretary LANE. Yes, sir; not a railroad. I think that is all that was done, and inasmuch as they could not get to work until the middle of June, which was the first day they could get into the country and work, I think they did exceptionally well.

The CHAIRMAN. They are engaged now in preparing reports of their work?

Secretary LANE. Yes; they are preparing a report on what they have done. Of course, their survey is not complete. Over the Susitna route they have a stake every hundred feet, but they do not know that that is the best possible route that could be made all of the way. That is particularly true when you get into the Mount McKinley country just southwest of Broad Pass. It may be they can find an easier and cheaper route than the one they have already surveyed and staked.

Mr. MONDELL. Did they also make any examination of the route from section 40 or in that locality on the Copper River road to the Bering field?

Secretary LANE. No; they have not attempted to do anything with the Bering River field except to connect up with an old survey.

Mr. GILLETTE. How large a force did they have?

Secretary LANE. I think, roughly, 300 men.

Mr. GILLETTE. How could they spend so much money?

Secretary LANE. We had a very close analysis made of their cost, and, of course, everything is very expensive, because everything has to be transported up there. There is no road up the Susitna. There is not even a trail through the Susitna Valley. On one side of the valley it is entirely bog and on the other side of the valley it is a forest.

Mr. GILLETTE. Is Susitna the name of the river?

Secretary LANE. Yes; the Susitna River goes right through the center of the valley. What we want to do is to be in a position to begin operations in June, wherever we are going, and we want to have some leeway, so that whatever road we determine to purchase, if we determine to purchase any, we will have some kind of a deposit to make on it.

The CHAIRMAN. And before you can start to do anything you must determine whether you are going to purchase one of the roads or not?

Secretary LANE. I think the first thing to do is to determine the route—which side to go up.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the law?

Secretary LANE. Yes; and then the second thing is to determine whether you want to buy any one of the existing roads or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The law provides they shall be purchased at their appraised value?

Secretary LANE. Not to exceed their appraised value; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. So that your purpose now is, after the route is determined, if you decide to purchase one of the roads, to purchase it and then be able to go ahead with the construction work in addition?

Secretary LANE. Yes; so as to get our coal available as soon as possible. That would be my idea.

The CHAIRMAN. That would be the first thing to do?

Secretary LANE. Yes.

Mr. GILLETTE. I suppose you can not give us any more in detail what you want to spend this money for?

Secretary LANE. No, because we do not know what road we will buy, or whether we will buy either one.

The CHAIRMAN. Could you furnish us, Mr. Secretary, with a detailed statement of the expenditures already made, and put that in the record?

Secretary LANE. Yes.

(The statement is as follows:)

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, February 3, 1915.

DEAR MR. FITZGERALD: In accordance with your request to me when I was before your committee the other day with respect to the appropriation for the construction by the Government of railroads in Alaska, I send to you a statement showing the expenditures made by the Alaskan Engineering Commission, in itemized form. This statement may be subject to a slight revision, but in no ways material to the actual amounts shown.

Cordially, yours,

FRANKLIN K. LANE.

HON. JOHN J. FITZGERALD,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives.

Analysis of expenditures made from the appropriation for the "Construction and operation of railroads in Alaska" to Jan. 31, 1915.

Equipment of camps and surveying camps:		
Purchase of surveying instruments	\$10,384.92	
Tents and tarpaulins	4,435.92	
Stoves, tools, utensils, and supplies	8,481.12	
Guns and ammunition	357.18	
Cameras and photo supplies	1,308.35	
Blankets and other bedding	3,411.00	
Drugs and medicines	645.76	
Freight	3,061.59	
		\$32,085.84
Pack animals and outfits:		
Purchase of pack animals	22,227.00	
Freight—		
Railroads in United States	196.48	
Ocean steamers	2,922.00	
River steamers, Alaska	1,491.35	
Railroads, Alaska (included in ocean freights), lighterage and wharfage	119.00	
Hire of pack animals	5,084.62	
Purchase of pack outfits	4,824.36	
Supplies for outfits	309.77	
Freight	51.13	
		37,225.71
Purchase, maintenance, and hire of boats:		
Purchase of boats—		
Launches	3,249.14	
Other boats	1,066.05	
Repairs and alterations	1,227.52	
Gasoline, oils, grease, and supplies	3,742.60	
Hire of launches	5,107.75	
Berthing boats for winter	126.50	
Freight on boats	545.80	
		15,005.96
Salary and wages:		
Commissioners and office force—		
Field season	17,609.89	
After close of field service	12,519.00	
Field employees, including temporary service after close of field service	156,983.96	
Employees in Alaska, left in custody of live stock and other property after close of field season	1,850.00	
		188,962.85
Stationery and drafting supplies:		
Purchase of stationery and technical supplies for both office and field, including typewriters and certain instruments not segregated	5,156.84	
Freight	344.42	
Advertising	50.92	
		5,552.18
Subsistence:		
Primary cost of provisions	35,614.64	
Freight	4,682.76	
Hotels and restaurants—		
In United States	2,406.88	
In Alaska	5,155.23	
Other subsistence items	1,044.65	
Per diem in lieu of subsistence	7,463.00	
		56,367.16
Subsistence and care of pack animals:		
Hay	13,274.94	
Freight	1,511.93	
Oats and other grain	4,587.28	
Freight	281.17	
Salt	49.93	
Stabling and care of pack animals—		
During field season	579.85	
Contracts for wintering	2,021.84	
Medical attendance and medicine	119.80	
Shoeing	606.25	
Shoes and nails	418.33	
Freight	27.92	
		23,479.22
Storage and rent of offices and warehouses:		
In Alaska	443.39	
In United States	947.10	
		1,390.49
Telephone and telegraph:		
Telephone	251.87	
Telegraph	224.57	
		476.44
Passenger transportation:		
Railroads, United States—		
Railroad fares	2,526.23	
Pullman fares	647.40	
Trolley	4.90	
Railroads in Alaska	3,144.05	
Fares for water travel—		
Ocean steamers	17,209.95	
River steamers, Alaska	6,660.60	
Launches, Alaska	728.90	
Automobiles, Alaska	204.00	
Automobiles, United States	128.00	
		31,254.03
Furniture:		
Purchase of furniture	651.25	
Rent of furniture	39.21	
		690.40
Medical attendance and hospital bills		296.85
Drayage:		
In Alaska	207.00	
In United States	65.73	
		272.73
Total		293,059.92
	<i>Costs per mile.</i>	
Total expenditures to Jan. 31, 1915		\$393,059.92
Less cost Kuskokwim reconnaissance		14,872.00
		378,187.92

By charging the balance of all expenditures against the 1,070 miles of accurate surveys an average is obtained of \$353.45 per mile.

The total cost of the Kuskokwim reconnaissance, as nearly as can be estimated without an exhaustive examination of account, but which will be found to be exceedingly close, is \$14,872. With a survey of 726 miles, the average cost per mile is \$20.48.

The cost of equipment is found to be \$58,044.63, of which about 75 per cent is still available. To this should be added provisions on hand estimated at between \$4,000 and \$5,000.

Equipment	\$58,044.63
Less depreciation and loss of 25 per cent	14,511.14
	43,533.49
Add provisions on hand	4,000.00
	47,533.49
Total cost of accurate surveys	378,187.92
Less equipment and supplies on hand	47,533.49
Balance	330,654.43

In round numbers, \$330,700.

By giving the above credit to amount expended it is found that the cost of accurate surveys is about \$300 per mile.

Summary in miles of line surveyed.

Final location	122.86
Preliminary surveys	875.99
Valuation surveys	70.8
Reconnaissance surveys (Kuskokwim)	726
Total	1,795.65

DEFINITIONS.

Final location: Lines ready for the construction engineer carefully marked on the ground with curves fully defined.

Preliminary surveys: Lines marked on the ground which, in connection with accurately taken topography, are used as bases from which to plan location.

Valuation surveys: Existing trackage rerun and measured, quantities measured, and a valuation placed on all improvements.

Reconnaissance: Exploration surveys to determine route possibilities. Grades and elevations determined by less refined methods than in preliminary surveys. All quantities estimated only approximately.

The ALASKAN ENGINEERING COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., February 2, 1915.

Mr. GILLET. I suppose whether you buy or not, in either case you expect to go on and begin construction work this summer, do you not?

Secretary LANE. Yes. We can not do anything on either side of Prince William Sound that will be of consequence unless we have enough money to pay something down on one of the roads, if we determine to buy one of them, and do some construction work; and, of course, there will be a considerable preliminary investment necessary for the doing of any construction work.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean that if you are to do any work during the coming season, commencing in June, from the information you have, an appropriation of \$2,000,000 is necessary?

Secretary LANE. I do.
The CHAIRMAN. In addition to what you have on hand?
Secretary LANE. In addition to what we have on hand.

The CHAIRMAN. What would you say as to appropriating \$1,000,000 instead of \$2,000,000, so that you would have about \$1,500,000?

Secretary LANE. That would not give you enough to do anything, if you were compelled to buy, or if you saw fit to buy, any of the roads.

The CHAIRMAN. If you determined to buy one of the roads and you made your arrangements to buy one of them, that would be all you could do with such an appropriation. You could not do any construction work?

Secretary LANE. You could not do any construction work.

The CHAIRMAN. So that part of the season would be lost for that purpose?

Secretary LANE. Yes.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Secretary, would there be any particular loss, aside, of course, from the postponement of the project, if nothing should be appropriated now, and the matter should be permitted to go over for another year?

Secretary LANE. Of course, the loss of time would be a very vital consideration with the people there.

Mr. MONDELL. Does the fact that no surveys were made to the Bering field indicate that the commission were of the opinion that the probability was that you would first want to utilize Matanuska coal?

Secretary LANE. I think this is the significance of that, that the Bering survey that has already been made is a very good and satisfactory one. The country is almost level, running from Controller Bay up, and they know approximately the amount of work that will have to be done on that route. I think you could almost begin work on that this year with the surveys we already have.

Mr. MONDELL. That were made—

Secretary LANE (interposing). That were made by the Copper River people; that were made by Ryan, and by our old Board of Engineers.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Secretary, we had an expedition to Alaska which brought back some coal that was tested out for the Navy, and my recollection of the report is that the coal clinkered so badly that it was stated that it would not be possible to use it for Navy vessels. Now, am I correct in supposing that there has been another test made with different results?

Secretary LANE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you tell us what the results of the test were?

Secretary LANE. Yes, sir. The practical outcome of the last test is the decision that for naval purposes this coal is as good or about as good as Pocahontas coal.

The CHAIRMAN. Was that coal taken from the same coal field?

Secretary LANE. It was taken from the Matanuska field.

The CHAIRMAN. The field from which the other coal was taken?

Secretary LANE. I do not remember whether there were two tests of coal taken from the Matanuska field or not, but one test was made of Bering River field coal, and that was a very poor test, so I am led to believe. It was a very poor test, because the coal was very much mixed up with clay and foreign matter. The result of that test was an adverse report. In the Matanuska test I am rather inclined to think—although this is hazy in my memory—but I am inclined to think that there was a body of Matanuska coal taken out at one time upon

which there was an adverse report, but there was a very small amount of it. The last report, however, upon the Matanuska coal was very favorable.

The CHAIRMAN. That early report I had in mind led to the conclusion that Alaska coal was unsuitable for the purpose.

Secretary LANE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. It led to the conclusion that Alaska coal was unsuitable for use in Navy vessels; and then my attention has been called to the fact that there has been a more recent test, the results of which were very different from those of that preliminary test.

Secretary LANE. I can send you a copy of that report.

The CHAIRMAN. We will be glad to have it.

NAVY DEPARTMENT, SUMMARY REPORT ON TEST OF MATANUSKA COAL.

Port test, seven days: All coal, ash, and clinker were weighed, one boiler was used, forced draft was necessary on two days. Run-of-mine coal was used for five days, slack for one day, and lump coal for one day. There were no casualties. Coal burned very freely. Firing was very good, the analyses of flue gases giving rarely below 9 per cent of CO₂. There was little clinker, but the ash was several per cent higher than with the Pocahontas coal. Draft was good and coal burned with bright yellowish flame. Coal coked very nicely; the coke was friable and very easily worked by the firemen. Fires 6 inches to 8 inches thick were carried most of the time, although occasionally they were heavier. The ash fused into clinker on the grate bars; generally about 2 inches thick, medium weight, porous, a little tough and hard while hot but friable when cold. The clinker had a little ash mixed throughout the mass. It stuck a little to the bridge wall, but not seriously. The soot deposit was about 25 per cent more than with Pocahontas coal. The soot was a little different from that of the Pocahontas as the granules appeared as minute fused grains. The load during this week of test would ordinarily have required two boilers burning Pocahontas coal.

Four-hour forced draft: Fires thin; dampers partly closed. Fires burned brightly; work of firing very easy on account of ease of breaking up the coke. Furnaces one mass of yellowish flame. Not an excessive amount of ash formed. The men, on being questioned, all said it was the easiest 20-knot run they had ever made.

Twenty-four hour 15-knot test: Started with 12 boilers, but necessary to cut out 4 boilers to get the highest efficiency. Coal burned with greatest ease, forming a very easily worked coke, not an excessive amount of ash or clinker, and in general appeared easier to handle than Pocahontas coal. CO₂ analysis generally high, over 9 per cent. Fires, carried 6 inches to 8 inches thick, were always glowing, ash pans bright, and the furnaces a mass of yellowish incandescent flame. Coal burned like pine knots. The amount of clinker was not excessive, was more or less easy to work and very friable when cold. Fires were noticeably hot. Amount of soot made was a little higher than is usually made by good Pocahontas coal, about 10 per cent more.

Ten-knot test: Started with six boilers, but it was found necessary to cut out two boilers to give greatest efficiency. This power was more than ample, as at times there were four evaporators in use. Fires were very easily worked; the coke broke up easy; clinker was not very hard; bright, level fires from 6 inches to 8 inches thick and sometimes thicker were carried, and CO₂ was generally high.

General remarks: There was very little foreign matter. The slack appeared to burn better than the lump. No evidences of gases being given off from the coal during the test. The noticeable characteristic of this coal is friability. Lumps pulverize very easily.

PORT TEST OF 7 DAYS.

Coal.	Total tons.	Gallons water evaporated.	Pounds coal per gallon.	Ash.	Efficiency.
Pocahontas.....	94,291	248,610	1.168	Per cent. 11.04	Per cent. 100
Bering River.....	136,391	247,783	.811	35.6	69.4
Matanuska.....	116,185	305,446	1.177	15.8	100.8

4-HOUR FORCED DRAFT, SPEED 20 KNOTS.

Coal.	Total tons.	Ash.	Smoke by scale.	Knots per ton.	Indicated horse-power.	Pounds per indicated horse-power.	Steaming radius.	Average efficiency.
Pocahontas....	79.1	P. ct. 8.8	2.4	1.02	20,820.3	2.09	2,367.8	P. ct. 100
Bering River..	127.3	38.8	1.5	.60	13,992.3	5.32
Matanuska....	85.484	18.67	2.8	.93	19,929.15	2.32	2,002.2	91

15 KNOTS—24-HOUR TEST.

Coal.	Total tons.	Ash.	Smoke by scale.	Knots per ton.	Indicated horse-power.	Pounds per indicated horse-power.	Steaming radius.	Average efficiency.
Pocahontas.....	153.155	7.6	1.25	2.38	7,083	2.01	4,781	100
Bering River....	100.3	35.0	.60	1.09	7,600	4.98	2,372	43
Matanuska.....	157.212	14.59	1.99	2.29	6,142.37	2.15	4,796.3	96

10 KNOTS—48-HOUR TEST.

Coal.	Total tons.	Ash.	Smoke by scale.	Knots per ton.	Indicated horse-power.	Pounds per indicated horse-power.	Steaming radius.	Average efficiency.
Pocahontas.....	137.325	10.5	1.18	3.15	2,134	3.08	7,077	100
Matanuska.....	118.582	15.67	1.86	3.37	2,686.527	3.09	7,160.6	98

The board found that this sample of Matanuska coal tested is suitable in every respect for use in the naval service.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,

BUREAU OF MINES,

Experiment Station, Pittsburgh, Pa., December 17, 1914.

Subject: Report on tests of Matanuska coal on U. S. S. Maryland.

The DIRECTOR: The following is Mr. Flagg's report upon the tests of Matanuska coal aboard the U. S. S. Maryland.

INSPECTION AND LOADING.

Upon the *Maryland's* arrival at Bremerton a visit was made to the coal dock, where some 7,700 sacks of the coal were stored under cover. On account of the receipt of a letter from the Bureau of Steam Engineering stating that preliminary tests at Annapolis indicated high ash content and instructing that the necessary preparation be given the coal, a preliminary inspection was made to gain some idea as to the quality of the coal. Rough determinations of the ash contents of the different sized parts of a sample taken from six bags at random failed to show any excessive percentages of ash, so the coal was loaded onto the lighters and placed in the ship's bunkers.

During the loading of the lighters a shovelful of coal was taken from every fifth bag and retained for a sample. This sample (of about 3 tons) was worked over and one can retained. From the same sample a portion (about 800 pounds) was taken for a sizing test. The percentages of the different sizes, the analyses of the samples of the several sizes, and the analysis of the general sample are given in attached sheets.

SEVEN-DAY PORT TEST.

The port test was begun as soon as one lighter of coal had been taken on. The load during part of the test period was heavy, but was carried throughout the test on one boiler. Fires were cleaned every 12 hours, by which time about 2 inches of clinker had formed. The clinker was medium weight, rather porous, and dark colored, with small pieces of light-gray ash mixed in with the fused portion. The clinker stuck some to the bridge wall, but not enough to cause serious trouble, and did not stick to the grates at all. In the furnace the clinker could be broken fairly easily; when cold it was brittle and easily broken.

During the port test the gas analyses showed 10 to 12 per cent CO₂ with probably three-tenths to four-tenths per cent CO. The effort was to carry fires 7 to 8 inches thick, but they were heavier much of the time, thus accounting in one way for the presence of CO.

The soot formed was comparatively free from tarry matter, and hence did not adhere to the tubes as much as does that from Pocahontas coal, although the amount of soot formed by the Matanuska coal was more than with Pocahontas.

The figures for the evaporation, on account of the difficulties incident to the measurement of the feed water, can only be considered approximate at best. The figures obtained during the port test showed an evaporation equal to or a little better than was obtained during the test with Pocahontas coal made by the *Maryland* in 1913.

On the last two days of the port test the use of screened coal was tried. The coal for this purpose was screened on the lighter alongside the dock. One day all of the coal remaining on a 4-mesh screen was used, and on the other that which passed through the screen. The only trouble experienced with the finer coal was that the natural draft was not quite strong enough to maintain the required rate of combustion at all times.

TWENTY-KNOT TEST.

The excellent steaming properties of this coal were plainly shown in this test. For a time it looked as if it would be possible to make the turns for 20 knots without putting on the blowers, but it was not done. With about three-fourths inch pressure of air in the firerooms, however, there was an abundance of steam, and steam could be raised to the popping-off pressure at any minute. This condition obtained throughout the four-hour test, and at its close the fires were still in excellent steaming condition.

FIFTEEN-KNOT TEST.

For the 15-knot test 12 boilers were lit up, but soon after the test was started 2 of these were put out and later a third. During the remainder of the test the turns were kept up most of the time with 8 boilers working and the ninth banked. Difficulty in maintaining the desired steam pressure with the 8 boilers was experienced only at times of cleaning the fires, and then only when the fires were cleaned too soon after each other. For cruising at this speed it has been the practice to use 10 boilers with eastern coal.

TEN-KNOT TEST.

Six boilers were lit for this run, but one was banked almost at the start of the test, and later it was cut out. About two and one-half hours after the test started a second boiler was banked, and this was cut out when the test had been in progress nine hours. During the remainder of the test four boilers only were used, these furnishing plenty of steam to make the proper number of turns and keep the regular auxiliaries going. For this speed the practice has been to use six boilers with Pocahontas coal. So far as is known, the *Maryland* has never before made turns for 10 knots with only four boilers in use.

GENERAL.

The coal as stored on the dock was dry but was wet on the lighters after they were placed alongside the ship. Neither on the dock nor in the bunkers was any tendency to heating noticed. The coal was almost entirely free from lumps, but, for the most part, was not objectionably fine.

It is a very friable coal, has moderate coking tendency, and is excellent for steaming purposes. The volatile matter appears to be fairly easily driven off but is not difficult to burn.

From the standpoint of smokelessness the coal is also very desirable. Under natural draft the stack observations ranged between No. 0 and No. 3 (Rengelmann chart), averaging somewhat above No. 2. Under forced draft during the four-hour run the smoke averaged about the same but showed less of the heavier smoke. The smoke is somewhat less in density than that from Pocahontas, and it is not as black.

Both officers and men cooperated heartily with the bureau's engineer throughout the test, and this cooperation was one factor contributing to the success of the tests.

Very truly, yours,

(Signed) O. P. Hood,
Chief Mechanical Engineer.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Secretary, I want to go a little further into the inquiry made by Mr. Gillett—that is, whether there is any other reason, further than the loss of time, why it would not be advisable to fail to make an appropriation at this time. You spoke of negotiations for some roads and also of the fact that the people up there were anxious to get their roads built. Of course, that is an anxiety that has existed for some years.

Secretary LANE. I do not know what other reasons could be given for any kind of improvement except the need of it for the development of the country. This enterprise has been embarked upon, and it strikes me that it would be wise for us to do something upon it. Now,

the expectation was, or, rather, they thought we should have some five or six million dollars for expenditure this year, and I think the bill as originally brought in contemplated some very large expenditures. I should say that \$2,000,000 is as small an amount as you could well spend this year, if you are to do anything at all. Certainly, if you are to buy any road and pay anything down on that road, we could not have much left for building anything.

Mr. SHERLEY. In the event that you built and did not buy, would the building open up a good deal of territory that otherwise would not be opened up?

Secretary LANE. Yes, sir; and did not buy?

Mr. SHERLEY. And did not buy.

Secretary LANE. We would open up a good deal of territory in any event.

Mr. SHERLEY. I understand; but what I had in mind was this, whether the building would simply mean practically the paralleling of one or the other of those roads or whether it would mean a route remote enough from either one of those roads to give that much additional transportation facilities to Alaska.

Secretary LANE. If we build on the west side, from Ship Creek up, it will be all new territory; and if we build on the east side, from Chitina up, it will be all new territory, as it is not contemplated—at least, not in my mind—to build a road competing with either one of the existing roads, unless we find that they are not reasonable as to terms.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I voted reluctantly in favor of the Alaskan railroad bill. At that time it was a question of whether there was any coal in either the Bering or the Matanuska fields that would be of value to the Navy. Since that vote was taken it has been proven positively by the tests made by the Navy Department that the coal in the Matanuska field is of superior quality and as good as that of the Pocahontas coal used by the Navy.

The question before the committee is whether we should try to develop and reach the Matanuska field. Under the Alaskan railroad bill authority is vested in the President to purchase, if he determines, at a price not to exceed the appraised physical value, any existing railroad. The survey has been made and \$350,000 in round numbers has been expended. They are now waiting to go ahead with the project. Undoubtedly the Alaskan Northern Railroad, which is built from Seward north 71 miles within 70 miles of the coal field, can be purchased at a reasonable value.

We left it to the President to determine whether it is more economical to purchase the existing road or build an additional one. There have been surveys made as to the building of a separate line to reach the Matanuska field, and everything awaits the decision of the President. Certainly it can not be claimed that whether we should build the entire road to Fairbanks or build on to the existing line from its terminus is a legislative question. That must be determined by the Secretary of the Interior and the President. I do not think there is anyone here who questions the good faith and the honesty of purpose of the Secretary and the President.

Now, why do they need \$2,000,000? They do not contemplate the purchase with \$2,000,000 of any existing line of railroads. It is necessary to deposit a substantial amount toward the purchase of one of the lines.

The gentlemen opposing the proposition to-day are those who opposed the original bill. That is not fair; for, by the action of Congress, it was determined that a certain policy should be adopted to extend these roads or build the road to reach the coal field; and it is not fair for those who opposed the original policy to hamstring it with no provision at all.

It is a business proposition. The Navy Department comes here and says that there has been coal discovered of high value that will save the Government hundreds of thousands of dollars in the transportation; and there is not a person, when he passes on that question, but what would say that that was a sufficient argument to vote for this proposition to give the President the authority to carry out the purpose of the law.

Oh, you can readily hold the matter up and suspend it in the air, saying that we will chloroform the project by withholding all appropriations entirely. But after Congress has passed on the project, has voted in favor of the measure, I do not believe that we should attempt to stab it indirectly by withholding appropriations. That time is past. It is the same Congress that passed on the project originally, and this is only in furtherance of the project by voting the necessary appropriation.

Secretary Lane, in the hearings, said it was proposed originally to recommend \$7,000,000 or \$8,000,000, but he curtailed it to \$2,000,000, the lowest possible amount, so as to have sufficient for a bonus or part payment in case they determined to purchase one of these lines.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, this presents simply a plain business proposition for the Congress to look at now. The matter of building a railroad or railroads in Alaska has already been passed upon and determined by this Congress. The Con-

gress has expressed its view and it has enacted a law that railroads shall be built in Alaska within certain limitations, and has also provided that a certain amount of money shall be expended for that purpose. The President is given the power to locate this road and to determine where it shall run from the southern coast of Alaska into the interior. In that same law he is given the power to purchase other railroads in getting a connecting line from the seacoast into the interior if he finds that he can make a business deal with the owners there that will be advantageous and that would be a good bargain for him to make for the Government. He has that power. You have already given him that power. It is no longer a question to be considered. The question now is an appropriation of \$2,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out a thing already decided upon. It occurs to me that is a very small amount to ask for, because we all know that the season for building railroads in Alaska is necessarily limited. We know that if we are going to get any work in there in 1915 the more money they have to do what can be done the better progress can be made, and there is no economy in having a small amount appropriated in view of the fact that you have to expend a certain amount to build your railroads, and your time is short. It is economy to avail yourself of whatever means you have and to do it quickly. There is much more to justify the building of the road now than there was when the bill was passed.

One of the great features that was contended for by the advocates of that bill was the benefit that this Government could get from the coal that was in Alaska. It had been claimed that tests had been made, and that it was not good for naval purposes. It was insisted by the Committee on the Territories that had investigated the matter that there was coal there admirably fitted for naval purposes. Since that time the test has been made, and the report is that it is as good as the best. What time could there be when we might be more in need of coal for naval use on the Pacific coast than right now, and the sooner we get that coal the greater the benefit will come from it. This railroad was not provided for for the purpose of buying a railroad or of enabling anybody to sell a railroad. The legislation was passed for the purpose of building railroads to develop Alaska. The President was given the power, if in his judgment he saw fit, to buy other lines in making this main line. If he is going to buy a railroad, give him the means to carry out the deal. If he is going to construct one, then give the President, through such agencies as he shall appoint, money enough to go to work to build the road. That is a mere business proposition. There is no business man who can look at it in any other light than that it is economy to amply supply the President with such means as he can make available within the season that is now coming on. We have had some temporary surveys made. The report has not yet been made as to what the surveys are. If they are sufficient for the President to decide where he will build the road, then he will construct it if necessary. So far as I am concerned, I am in hopes that he will not buy many miles of railroad. There is the Copper River Railroad of 186 miles, and I hope that he will not buy that, for the simple reason that Alaska already has that railroad, and the object of this legislation was to supply Alaska with railroads. I want this money expended in building other miles of railroads, so that Alaska may be developed. [Applause.]

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TREBBLE] to strike out this section. I made the same motion in the committee, and if no one else had made it I would have made it here. But I have tried several times to come to the rescue of the Treasury, and my advances have not been received on that side of the House with the cordiality which my disinterested purpose deserved, and I hope, now that the motion comes from the gentleman from Georgia, it will receive better attention. I base my reason on the fact so graphically and correctly stated by the gentleman from Georgia, that the country to-day is bleeding at every pore and I do not think we ought to bleed it any further. This Congress, despite its condition, is putting the knife in deeper and deeper, and more and more copious streams of blood are coming out, and you are not doing as we did when we bled the Treasury. You are not supplying new blood, new revenue, to come in and take the place of that which is extracted. But there is a deficit staring us in the face. I have said it so many times I do not like to say it again, and I know you still less like to hear it again, but now is the time to dispense with luxuries and satisfy ourselves with necessities, and it seems to me this railroad is not a necessity. The only argument that was brought before us in our hearings which indicated that this money really was needed this year was the suggestion that one of the railroads might be pur-

chased, and now perhaps was a more advantageous time than any other because otherwise it might be sold to somebody else or developed. But I suspect that the Secretary who told us that was not thoroughly informed, because I have heard from several sources that that railroad has been bankrupt for a long time. They have been trying to sell it, and it can not be sold, and they are looking to find a purchaser and it probably will not be sold. Certainly human nature would indicate that when there is a possibility of the Government paralleling it nobody is going to purchase that road until we have determined what the Government is going to do. So it does not seem to me there is any pressure now to get that railroad. If we are not going to get that, I see no reason for haste.

In regard to the coal fields that the gentleman from Wisconsin speaks about, they have found excellent coal there, but whether it is so located and whether it is not so broken it would not be available for commercial use has yet to be decided. The mere fact that they have found specimens of excellent coal does not show that it is merchantable coal and that the railroad will ever bring it out in useful amounts.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT. No; I have not the time. Now, I think the gentleman stated a very fair argument that those who are opposed to this railroad in general ought not now on that ground to combat it; but it is not on that ground I place my opposition, though I admit I was one of those who were strongly opposed to building this railroad by the Government. I did not think it was a good investment for the Government. I do not believe it will ever be remunerative. I think it will be extremely costly and extravagant. But I recognize the House voted for it. The House, I assume, still is in favor of it, but that is not the argument which I suggest. The ground on which I to-day place my opposition is the same ground on which I have opposed other appropriations in this bill. There is no necessity for this expenditure, and here is a saving of \$2,000,000, which the Treasury sadly needs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I presume the proper thing to do is to make the appropriation now, since we have passed the bill; but whenever anybody has any old junk in the shape of a railroad or a lot of rotten ships to sell and they can not sell them to anybody else they come to Congress and get a law passed authorizing the Government to buy them. That is what we are doing now. That is what the Senate is trying to do now—to pass a bill to buy ships. We passed a bill to buy a railroad, and we are undoubtedly going to buy it. When this bill was up for consideration a great many men in the House said that we were going to build railroads in Alaska to prevent the monopolists from controlling Alaska and from preventing highway robbers from charging freight rates that were beyond reason, and they named the Guggenheims and others. I think I recall saying on that occasion that if any of these men had violated the law they ought to be arrested, prosecuted, and put in jail, not favored by money from the Government with which to buy railroads.

If we are going to build railroads to develop the coal fields, we ought to build our roads, not buy junk and not relieve men who are already overridden with mortgages from the burdens which they are carrying with means obtained from the Treasury of the United States. Every city in America to-day is witnessing the spectacle of men in the public service either being discharged or reduced from \$1,200 to \$1,000 a year because of the lack of funds with which to pay them, and yet we go on and appropriate money and empty the Treasury at the expense of the blood, bone, and sinew of the men who are at work in these great departments of the Government. We have no thought or consideration, but we go on with our reckless waste and extravagance and appropriate money to build railroads and buy junk in the shape of streaks of rust in the form of railroad tracks, and junk in the form of ships that are being wasted, tied up at the docks, with no money in the Treasury, and yet continue to tax the overburdened idle people of America in order that the administration may have its way. The American people are going to speak upon this question if they have not already spoken. The time is coming that you will hear what they have to say. There is no public sentiment for this character of expenditure, no public sentiment whatever, and I regret that we are pledged under the law that is already enacted to appropriate this money to authorize the purchase of roads which the men who favored the enactment of the law denounced when the bill was under consideration during the last session of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] made the statement that the Delegate

from Alaska, when the Alaska railroad bill was originally under discussion, declared that surveys along the proposed routes had been actually made and all that was necessary was to choose the route.

Mr. MADDEN. I said I understood so.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Well, the Delegate from Alaska was interrogated about that matter at very considerable length when making his statement in support of the original bill, and the gentleman from Illinois was probably justified in his understanding, because the Delegate from Alaska did at that time say that each one of those proposed routes had been surveyed.

One of them had been surveyed for the route of a Government military wagon road, and the other had a preliminary survey line run over it for a railroad; and upon interrogation by different Members of the House I went into that matter and explained quite fully and according to the facts. The Record will show how fully, but no statement was made that the surveys for a railroad had been completed, and that the only act remaining was to choose the route.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] reminds me that when the original bill was before the House he said that if transportation men, and specially mentioned the Guggenheim interests, had violated the laws of the United States relating to monopoly and extortion in respect to transportation in Alaska they ought to be arrested, prosecuted, and punished, and not favored by the purchase of their roads.

Mr. MADDEN. I say so now.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I have the pleasure to inform the gentleman from Illinois that since the date when he said that the United States District Court at Juneau, Alaska, did that very thing—found them guilty and then fined them \$25,000 upon their plea of guilty. They admitted the charges made against them, and which I repeated on the floor of the House at the time mentioned, and came into court and paid their fines. The Alaska railroad bill is doing much good in many ways, and Alaska is confident that it will yet do much more.

Mr. Chairman, some gentlemen in the House seem to be greatly excited over the thought that the President of the United States may purchase the Copper River & Northwestern Railway, often called the Guggenheim Railroad, in Alaska. I am surprised at gentlemen on that side of the House pointing the finger of suspicion at President Wilson and Secretary Lane, and suggesting that in some way or other they are going to fail to live up in good faith to the purposes of the Alaska railway act, which authorizes the President to locate and construct railroads in Alaska, and that the administration will fail to do its duty, but will purchase the Guggenheim railroad. And if I did not misunderstand the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE], he declared that that was the purpose of the appropriation of this \$2,000,000.

Now, if I did misunderstand the gentleman, I apologize. If I did not, I challenge his statement. It is not true. There is no man on the floor of this House who knows what route the President will yet choose. He has not yet said to the country what, in his judgment, is the best route over which to build the railroad authorized by the act. The only evidence we have on that score is the evidence of Secretary Lane, stated in his testimony before the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations. There he asked for \$2,000,000, and stated that less than one-half of the original million appropriated had been expended.

On the next page of this testimony, all of which the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DAVENPORT] will put in the Record, he is asked this question by Mr. MONDELL:

Are you still considering, Mr. Secretary, the possibility of entirely new construction?

Secretary Lane said, "Yes."

Mr. MONDELL. I mean new construction for the entire distance.
Secretary LANE. For the entire distance; yes.

Now, it is true that in his statement he said, "Of course, if we bought the Cordova road it would depend upon the terms we could get," and so forth. But in no part of his statement does he say that it is the intention to buy either the Copper River or the Alaska Northern Railroads; nor is there any official statement from the President or anyone that it is the purpose to buy the Guggenheim road; and I am just as justified as the gentleman from Georgia when I assert that it is not intended to buy that road. The testimony of the Secretary is that this appropriation of \$2,000,000 is to be used for new construction, although Secretary Lane does say that the President may negotiate for the purchase of one of the present roads if the President thinks it advisable.

And the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE], in a most eloquent statement, described the conditions of the Government finances and declared that they are being so rapidly reduced that there is a need to limit appropriations. He asserted that the Government finances are being dissipated, that the body politic is bleeding at every pore, and for a Member from that side of the House he certainly made a frank attack on the financial policy of this administration. Aided by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET], he makes out a strong case of blood letting on the part of the administration which he so ably assisted into power and which is now attempting by progressive legislation to open the door to development without monopoly in Alaska.

Let me say to the gentlemen who are so excited over the thought that the building of the Alaskan railroad will further diminish the lifeblood of the Nation that Alaska is producing what you say is running so rapidly out of the body politic, to wit, gold. Here is the report of the collector of customs of the Territory of Alaska for the year 1914, and it shows that in that year Alaska produced gold to the amount of \$14,729,908. It shows also that in 1914 the people of Alaska purchased merchandise from the merchants of the United States to the amount of \$21,610,860. The imports of Alaska for 1914 were \$25,849,944, and the exports \$44,614,696. The total trade with the United States was \$70,464,640. We sent you copper, \$3,365,342; canned salmon, \$17,906,215; and gold, \$14,729,908.

Let me show you how that affects the railroad for which this appropriation is being made. The output of gold from the Seward-Valdez-Cordova region—the coast terminal region of the road—for the year 1914 was \$1,491,248, while the people there purchased merchandise from the United States of the value of \$4,039,705, a total from that end of the proposed railroad for the year of \$5,530,953. The output from the Fairbanks end of the road for 1914 was: Gold produced, \$6,399,315; merchandise purchased from the United States, \$2,978,640; a total of \$9,377,955. Both ends of the proposed line in 1914 produced gold and bought merchandise of the total value of \$14,908,908. Every dollar of that sum came into the channels of trade in the United States, and it will be greatly increased by the building of the road for which the appropriation is being made.

Some inquiry is also made as to the amount of mineral wealth which Alaska has produced since its purchase in 1867. Senate Document No. 882, Sixty-second Congress, second session, contains the details of this and other trade values of Alaska prepared by me up to 1911. It shows that to that date Alaska's sea and fur products amounted to \$222,710,036, while the mineral products amounted to \$206,813,594. The report of the collector of customs for Alaska for 1914 shows that for the years 1912, 1913, and 1914 the mineral products—gold and copper—amounted to \$55,726,065, which added to the total to 1911 makes a total for mineral products in Alaska from 1867 to 1914 of \$262,539,659. The amount of the sea and fur products is even larger, and the grand total of the products of Alaska for the period from 1867 to 1914 is more than \$550,000,000.

If the gentlemen from Georgia and Massachusetts want to stop the financial body in the United States from "bleeding at every pore," as they described it, let them study the Alaskan trade reports and assist in pushing this railroad to completion, and Alaska alone will fill the United States with the golden lifeblood in such quantity as to make such pleas more laughable in the future than they are now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alaska has expired.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to extend my remarks in the Record by adding thereto the annual report of the collector of customs of Alaska for the year 1914.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HUGHES of Georgia). If there is no objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The report is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE,
OFFICE OF THE COLLECTOR,
Port of Juneau, Alaska, January 25, 1915.

This report of the general trade relations of the Territory shows satisfactory results and evidences a substantial growth. The increase of business over the previous year indicates that had Alaska not been materially affected by the general commercial depression which retarded some important developments, reduced the price and production of copper and certain fish products, this year's transactions would have been the greatest in its history.

Imports and exports of foreign gold and silver, and most of the exports foreign, as shown below, are in transit. The other items cover the real trade of the country.

Commerce of Alaska.

	Calendar years—			
	1911	1912	1913	1914
IMPORTS.				
Merchandise from the United States.....	\$15,169,149	\$21,992,761	\$21,689,690	\$21,610,890
Merchandise from foreign ports.....	519,221	925,034	751,173	662,994
Gold and silver from foreign ports.....	3,520,170	3,840,546	4,320,985	3,576,090
Total imports.....	19,208,540	26,758,341	26,761,848	25,849,944
EXPORTS.				
Merchandise to the United States.....	19,318,859	24,793,886	22,252,942	25,427,873
Merchandise to foreign ports.....	1,174,393	1,452,955	1,141,600	1,006,518
Domestic gold and silver to the United States.....	14,699,694	16,031,705	12,959,266	14,729,905
Foreign gold and silver to the United States.....	3,353,361	3,704,173	4,306,591	3,450,400
Total exports.....	38,546,307	45,982,719	40,660,459	44,614,696
Grand total of imports and exports.....	57,754,847	72,741,060	67,422,307	70,464,640

The following table of Alaska's products entering into commerce shows these interesting features: The greatest export of canned salmon and a marked increase in fish oils, precious metals, and marble.

The value of fur shipments by mail, amounting to \$182,084, was received too late to be shown in the table. This amount added to the value shown below gives the proper total.

Value of domestic merchandise and gold and silver shipped from Alaska to the United States.

Articles.	1911	1912	1913	1914
Copper ore and matte.....	\$2,898,885	\$4,904,715	\$3,765,132	\$3,365,342
Fish:				
Salmon, canned.....	13,136,980	15,551,794	13,349,438	17,906,215
Salmon, all other.....	502,134	907,242	1,074,483	750,512
All other fish and fish products.....	478,497	589,529	1,032,274	908,921
Fish fertilizers.....	63,439	41,662	53,657	51,463
Fish and whale oil.....	170,991	283,339	243,096	310,344
Furs.....	816,850	728,554	672,633	610,401
Gypsum.....	124,200	129,375	129,375	107,347
Marble.....	49,455	77,159	92,588	119,796
Tin ore and concentrates.....	41,830	90,831	72,734	71,400
Whalebone.....	20,551	18,012	80
Other merchandise.....	852,753	1,000,261	1,188,834	1,226,132
Gold and silver.....	14,699,694	16,031,705	12,959,266	14,729,905
Total.....	33,856,264	40,354,178	34,693,590	40,157,778

Comparative statement of domestic merchandise and gold and silver shipped from Alaska to the United States for 6 years previous to 1911.

1905.....	\$22,065,733
1906.....	30,759,159
1907.....	27,682,263
1908.....	30,299,788
1909.....	31,686,112
1910.....	28,660,279

Gold and silver shipped to the United States.

Judicial divisions.	1911	1912	1913	1914
First.....	\$3,730,264	\$4,040,858	\$3,586,164	\$4,177,069
Second.....	3,246,498	3,138,881	2,239,057	2,662,273
Third.....	404,861	734,507	592,008	1,491,248
Fourth.....	7,318,071	8,117,459	6,542,037	6,399,315
Total.....	14,699,694	16,031,705	12,959,266	14,729,905

The following table of passenger movement indicates the travel, by regularly established routes, to and from the district and the Yukon Territory. Tourists and cannery employees bound for remote places are not included.

The Eagle and Dawson movement shows the local frontier travel, which must not be considered with the general account, as the greater number of those passengers arrived or departed from Ketchikan or St. Michael and have been accounted for in their returns:

Passenger movement.

ARRIVALS FROM THE UNITED STATES AND BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Routes.	1912	1913	1914
Southeastern, southern, and western Alaska.....	20,645	21,963	23,822
Nome, St. Michael, and Bering Sea.....	2,067	1,795	1,491
Total.....	22,712	23,758	25,313

Passenger movement—Continued.

DEPARTURES TO THE UNITED STATES AND BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Routes.	1912	1913	1914
Southeastern, southern, and western Alaska.....	18,502	21,376	22,645
Nome, St. Michael, and Bering Sea.....	3,375	2,974	1,893
Total.....	21,877	24,350	24,538
Arrivals at Eagle from Dawson.....	594	914	785
Departures from Eagle to Dawson.....	935	1,448	1,102
Total.....	1,529	2,362	1,887

An indication of the industrial progress of the Territory is found in the quantity of merchandise imported from the States. Developments and operations in the southeastern division were very active during the first half of the year, and had they continued a very interesting return would have been made; the result, however, shows a satisfactory increase over the previous year. The southern division makes some improvement, but the divisions where the great gold placers are located have met with the natural decline due to the exhaustion of the more easily exploited deposits.

Comparative statement showing value of merchandise shipped from the United States to the different divisions of Alaska.

Divisions.	1910	1911	1912	1913	1914
Southeastern Alaska.....	\$5,256,325	\$5,492,416	\$9,769,224	\$9,725,472	\$11,075,532
Southern Alaska.....	4,538,225	3,246,464	4,321,689	3,979,178	4,039,705
Bering Sea, etc.....	4,150,679	2,919,456	4,168,934	4,200,520	3,516,983
St. Michael and Yukon River.....	3,506,359	3,510,813	3,732,914	3,784,520	2,978,640
Total.....	17,451,588	15,169,149	21,992,761	21,689,690	21,610,860

The tables following give the value of merchandise shipped to Alaska from the United States for the year 1914, segregated as to place of consignment, with comparative statements for five years, and general customs transactions by ports.

J. F. PUGH, Collector of Customs.

Value of merchandise shipped from the United States to southeastern Alaska.

Beaulere.....	\$28,471
Burnett Inlet.....	32,650
Cape Edwards.....	35,269
Chatham.....	66,069
Chichagof.....	75,900
Chilkoot.....	42,938
Chomly.....	94,788
Craig.....	63,320
Dolomi.....	10,415
Douglas.....	495,432
Dundas.....	43,082
Excursion Inlet.....	141,770
Funter Bay.....	93,414
Georges Inlet.....	13,418
Glacier.....	46,380
Gypsum.....	18,694
Hadley.....	31,730
Haines.....	274,273
Hawk Inlet.....	50,574
Heceta.....	22,105
Hidden Inlet.....	47,397
Holbrook.....	10,237
Hoonah.....	71,202
Hunters Bay.....	50,527
Hydaburg.....	13,958
Jualin.....	73,640
Juneau.....	4,017,710
Kake.....	41,955
Karheen.....	40,400
Kasaan.....	92,933
Kensington.....	10,086
Ketchikan.....	1,548,228
Killsnoo.....	34,755
Klawack.....	48,583
Klukwan.....	1,918
Lake Bay.....	41,650
Loring.....	126,655
Metlakatla.....	17,490
Molra Sound.....	35,399
Naket Inlet.....	14,296
Petersburg.....	246,556
Point Ellis.....	38,246
Point Ward.....	43,255
Poreupine.....	2,534
Port Armstrong.....	21,343
Quadra.....	52,136
Roe Point.....	65,439
Rose Inlet.....	88,531
Santa Ana.....	45,409
Shakan.....	61,707
Sitka.....	167,451
Skagway.....	390,561
Sulzer.....	17,498
Taku.....	80,452
Tee Harbor.....	49,778
Tenakee.....	14,944
Token.....	30,320
Treadwell.....	1,002,372
Tyee.....	5,954
Wards Cove.....	44,410

Warm Chuck	\$3,069
Waterfall	45,684
Wrangell	355,558
Yes Bay	82,596

Total 11,075,532

Comparative statement of principal places in southeastern Alaska.

Name.	1910	1911	1912	1913	1914
Douglas	\$362,290	\$357,467	\$484,798	\$473,901	\$495,432
Haines	274,953	248,700	343,205	290,894	274,273
Juneau and Thane	745,822	655,182	1,417,910	3,240,681	4,017,710
Ketchikan	564,894	711,144	1,454,783	1,250,878	1,548,228
Loring	116,284	159,463	142,307	120,521	126,655
Petersburg	236,627	238,075	353,379	341,170	246,556
Sitka	212,000	171,138	143,654	218,101	167,451
Skagway	275,738	225,785	709,529	369,799	390,561
Treadwell	1,321,739	1,061,545	890,453	1,024,027	1,002,372
Wrangell	245,820	248,627	526,727	419,761	355,558
All other places	880,158	1,415,290	3,302,479	1,975,739	2,450,736
Total	5,236,325	5,492,416	9,709,224	9,725,472	11,075,532

Value of merchandise shipped from the United States to southern Alaska from Yakutat to Unalaska and Dutch Harbor.

Afognak	\$19,549
Akutan	21,966
Allak	41,997
Chignik	150,294
Chisana	17,534
Chitina	130,273
Cold Bay	7,519
Cooks Inlet	60,563
Copper Center	4,875
Cordova	783,834
Ellamar	88,450
Hope	31,106
Iliamna	13,833
Karluk	77,823
Katalla	24,602
Kenai	115,623
Kennecott	115,729
King Cove	120,714
Knik	237,472
Kodiak	113,433
Latouche	205,550
McCarthy	97,719
Northwest Harbor	4,718
Orea	70,369
Ouzinkie	1,485
Pavlof	6,973
Pirate Cove	22,895
Portage Bay	7,916
Port Graham	47,291
Port Wells	16,257
Sand Point	23,501
Sannak	8,639
Seldovia	52,278
Seward	302,888
Ship Creek	26,880
Strelina	2,532
Susitna	32,366
Unalaska	51,599
Unga	73,720
Uyak	60,392
Valdez	658,302
Yakataga	2,665
Yakutat	86,121
Total	4,039,705

Comparative statement of principal places in southern Alaska.

Name.	1910	1911	1912	1913	1914
Chignik	\$319,298	\$307,273	\$488,681	\$277,339	\$150,294
Chitina	8,602	63,502	106,740	109,553	130,273
Cordova	2,071,007	775,981	888,155	832,067	783,834
Ellamar	34,862	25,960	42,584	86,453	88,851
Karluk	129,511	174,480	178,151	130,703	77,823
Katalla	85,395	73,903	71,412	47,861	24,062
Kodiak	81,436	69,390	123,586	111,489	125,841
Latouche	66,823	66,687	83,715	106,323	217,958
Orea	55,087	57,163	69,066	69,939	70,369
Seward	230,206	230,095	278,061	231,704	315,296
Uyak	30,164	42,605	87,958	104,019	60,392
Valdez	805,295	685,203	563,609	716,944	670,710
All other places	619,939	624,262	1,339,971	1,154,074	1,436,074
Total	4,538,225	3,246,464	4,321,689	3,979,178	4,039,705

Value of merchandise shipped from the United States to all places on Bering Sea and Arctic Ocean, except St. Michael.

Bethel	\$55,303
Bristol Bay	1,227,787
Candle	46,799
Cape York	37,286
Council	47,506
Cripple Creek	13,486
Deering	37,445
Dickson	12,246
Gambell	1,171
Colovin	76,024
Icy Cape	1,512
Igloo	1,162
Keewalik	12,826
Kogglung	201,136
Kotzebue	79,936
Kuskokwim	2,196
Naknek	1,782

Nome	\$926,808
Nushagak	350,823
Point Barrow	34,047
Point Hope	3,726
Port Moller	103,521
Pribilof Islands	36,066
Shungnak	13,332
Sinuk	1,236
Solomon	93,354
Tacotna	28,449
Teller	60,803
Unalakleet	9,215

Total 3,516,983

Comparative statement of principal places, Bering Sea and Arctic Ocean.

Name.	1910	1911	1912	1913	1914
Bristol Bay	\$1,833,579	\$1,153,359	\$1,820,829	\$1,774,890	\$1,227,787
Candle	79,054	53,534	68,346	70,925	46,799
Deering	41,827	23,710	90,891	66,967	37,445
Golovin	77,010	43,899	77,010	109,759	76,024
Kvichak	63,870	127,901	63,870	220,208
Nome	1,145,758	1,060,995	1,279,395	1,223,599	926,808
Teller and Port Clarence	13,363	48,450	65,877	41,232	60,803
All other places	896,218	407,610	702,715	692,940	1,141,317
Total	4,150,679	2,919,456	4,168,934	4,200,520	3,516,983

Value of merchandise shipped from the United States to St. Michael and the Yukon Basin.

Anvik	\$17,297
Beaver	1,444
Bettles	26,974
Chatinika	4,690
Chena	14,984
Circle	74,986
Dikeman	47,304
Eagle	65,142
Fairbanks	1,304,556
Fort Yukon	20,039
Fortymile River	3,812
Hamilton	7,959
Holy Cross	23,426
Hot Springs	158,308
Iditarod	323,343
Innoko	14,324
Kaltag	6,740
Kokrines	1,578
Koyukuk	25,572
Louden	3,290
Marshall City	1,874
Minto	2,846
Mountain Village	1,809
Nenana	4,041
Nulato	12,776
Ophir	4,354
Rampart	19,523
Ruby	169,262
Russian Mission	4,462
St. Michael	387,492
Stevens Village	4,882
Tanana	199,716
Tofty	7,571
Tolovana	9,080
Yakakaket	3,184
Total	2,978,640

Comparative statement of principal places in Yukon district.

Name.	1910	1911	1912	1913	1914
Chena	\$120,799	\$120,589	\$159,217	\$101,788	\$14,984
Eagle	75,198	25,672	47,637	33,364	65,142
Fairbanks	1,096,550	895,101	1,391,025	1,280,506	1,304,556
Hot Springs	51,529	83,830	67,032	115,490	153,308
Iditarod	241,179	523,234	286,770	482,189	323,343
Ruby	13,784	201,444	289,750	169,262
St. Michael	1,544,101	1,458,616	989,968	854,373	387,492
Tanana	170,926	186,422	213,509	241,317	199,716
All other places	206,077	201,565	376,262	385,743	355,837
Total	3,506,359	3,510,813	3,732,914	3,784,520	2,978,640

Statement of number and tonnage of vessels entered and cleared for the year ended Dec. 31.

DOMESTIC TRADE.

Port.	1913				1914			
	Entered.		Cleared.		Entered.		Cleared.	
	Num-ber.	Ton-nage.	Num-ber.	Ton-nage.	Num-ber.	Ton-nage.	Num-ber.	Ton-nage.
Ketchikan	721	390,693	652	371,996	736	424,630	709	400,630
Wrangell	14	10,373	7	2,218	5	2,251	8	2,386
Juneau	13	19,685	16	17,878	10	27,729	14	23,189
Skagway	9	8,532	19	19,635	3	4,396
St. Michael	8	10,475	8	8,749	9	12,309	1	2,112
Nome	21	35,461	25	45,011	15	25,670	20	30,343
Unalaska	13	8,902	7	609	12	5,827	15	5,425
Cordova	5	7,153	15	22,705	6	9,941	17	27,534
Sulzer	8	2,787	21	16,016	12	6,866	23	13,668
Total	812	493,066	770	504,817	805	515,283	810	509,683

Statement of number and tonnage of vessels entered and cleared for the year ended Dec. 31—Continued.

Port.	1913				1914			
	Entered.		Cleared.		Entered.		Cleared.	
	Num-ber.	Ton-nage.	Num-ber.	Ton-nage.	Num-ber.	Ton-nage.	Num-ber.	Ton-nage.
Ketchikan.....	234	157,480	204	123,812	253	148,925	228	129,356
Wrangell.....	25	9,296	20	2,881	33	2,020	35	2,451
Juneau.....	3	4,382	1	1,985	2	2,090
Skagway.....	1	1,377	1	1,495
Eagle.....	71	31,665	74	32,373	52	19,508	52	19,988
St. Michael.....	1	78
Nome.....	22	8,297	18	6,004	25	1,754	22	3,782
Unalaska.....	2	4,729	1	55	4	4,463	2	476
Cordova.....	1	2,080
Sulzer.....	7	280	8	427	7	65	10	797
Total.....	365	217,506	327	167,617	378	182,403	349	156,850

Recapitulation of customs business for the year ended Dec. 31, 1914.

Port.	Vessels entered.		Vessels cleared.		Entries taken.	Ves-sels docu-ment-ed.	Total ves-sels en-tered.	Total ves-sels cleared.
	For-ign.	Coast-wise.	For-ign.	Coast-wise.				
Ketchikan.....	253	736	228	709	122	183	989	937
Wrangell.....	33	5	35	8	118	84	38	43
Juneau.....	2	10	14	93	152	12	14
Skagway.....	1	3	567	1	3
Eagle.....	52	52	102	3	52	52
St. Michael.....	9	1	2	24	9	1
Nome.....	25	15	22	20	44	62	40	42
Unalaska.....	4	12	2	15	6	30	16	17
Cordova.....	1	6	17	15	7	17
Sulzer.....	7	12	10	23	1	23	19	33
Forty Mile.....	34
Total.....	378	805	349	810	1,089	576	1,183	1,159

List of officers and employees in the Alaska customs service.

Name.	Title.	Station.
J. F. Pugh.....	Collector.....	Juneau.
C. D. Garfield.....	Special deputy collector.....	Do.
M. S. Whittier.....	Deputy collector and inspector.....	Do.
D. A. Meek.....	Stenographer and typewriter.....	Do.
Geo. M. Simpkins.....	Deputy collector and inspector.....	Do.
Milson S. Dobbs.....	Deputy collector in charge.....	Ketchikan.
Geo. W. Woodruff.....	Deputy collector and inspector.....	Do.
F. E. Bronson.....	Deputy collector in charge.....	Wrangell.
Fred J. Vandewall.....	do.....	Skagway.
G. G. Miller.....	Deputy collector and inspector.....	Do.
J. J. Hillard.....	Deputy collector in charge.....	Eagle.
John L. Abrams.....	do.....	Forty Mile.
John Elden.....	Deputy collector and inspector.....	Do.
Edwin R. Stivers.....	Deputy collector in charge.....	St. Michael.
R. W. J. Reed.....	do.....	Nome.
N. E. Bolshamin.....	do.....	Unalaska.
Geo. Kennedy.....	do.....	Cordova.
Chas. A. Sulzer.....	do.....	Sulzer.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Twenty minutes remain.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I did not support the proposition for the Government to engage in railroad building and operation in Alaska, as I would not support a proposition for the Government to engage in that business anywhere. I did not believe it was a governmental function, and I do not believe so yet. However old-fashioned that idea may be, I expect to hold to it for some time, at least so long as I have my faculties of reasoning about it and reflecting upon what I have studied and read and the conclusions I have arrived at upon that subject.

But it is not because I opposed that bill, nor is it because I opposed that policy, that I shall support the amendment to strike out this provision of \$2,000,000 or vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DAVENPORT] to make it \$1,000,000. That project can wait. The expenditure of large sums of money upon this project can wait for a year; it can wait until a more propitious season and a more propitious time, when we can be enabled, by reason of an improvement of the present condition of affairs prevailing, by which our revenues have been reduced, to supply the necessary money to carry out this project.

Why, nothing has been done, so to speak. True, they have spent a large sum of money, some \$330,000, in making the survey, but even yet they have got no report. They have a verbal statement from these people who have gone up there and driven stakes and gone over the land, but they have no written report about what the cost will be.

Mr. HOUSTON. Does not the gentleman understand that the engineering commission are now preparing a report, and that they have not yet completed it?

Mr. BARTLETT. I do not deny that.

Mr. HOUSTON. They can not file it until it is completed.

Mr. BARTLETT. They have not had the time or the energy to complete it, or they have not devoted their time to it, I do not know which. They have not yet made a report upon which Congress can act, so that Congress can ascertain what they have done and what they expect to do. Yet we are asked now, simply because this may be a favorite project, to carry out somebody's policy, to appropriate this large sum of money, when we do not know what they have done or what they propose to do. We do not know what the expenditures may be in the future. I have made no misstatement about it. We have not yet, says the Secretary, got the completed report, nor in fact any report in writing.

I do not know anything about it, except what the Secretary testified before the Appropriations Committee. He said we have not got any report in writing.

It is proposed now to embark on this unusual and, in my judgment, unnecessary and improper policy of the Government engaging in this sort of business, to show that we are so anxious to spend the money of the Government.

Mr. HOUSTON. I want to ask if the gentleman does not realize that there is nothing involved in that report except the mere matter of location?

Mr. BARTLETT. Oh, well, it is important to know how much money is to be required, and they do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] is recognized.

Mr. BRYAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois to make a brief statement.

Mr. MANN. I want to make this statement, if I may: When the Alaska Railroad bill was brought into the House, it provided for the sale of bonds to pay for the cost of the railroad. We struck that out in the House. I did what I could to have it go out, and we took that action, with the statement that we would provide by appropriations for the necessary construction and so forth of the road as we went along. And I feel under a moral obligation myself, and I think the House is under a moral obligation to make this appropriation, and such others as are necessary for the road, within the original limit of cost. [Applause.]

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I think there is no one on this floor who doubts the absolute sincerity of the gentleman who is the senior member of the minority on the Appropriations Committee [Mr. GILLET] when he makes this statement that he would like to strike this appropriation from this bill. We all like him, and we know he is sincere. We also like the distinguished gentleman from Georgia on the other side of the House [Mr. BARTLETT], who, I understand, would also like to strike this appropriation from the bill.

I call the attention of this House to the fact that only yesterday the same distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] moved to strike from this bill the appropriation of \$3,000,000 that was given to the Interstate Commerce Commission for the physical valuation of the railroads of this country, and in that motion had the support of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT]. I suppose in doing that Mr. GILLET expressed the position that he would take in case the Republican Party were in power and he was the chairman of that committee. I do not know. I suppose he would be loyal to his ideas. But when it came to a vote here on this floor on a division there were only 13 Members who were with the gentleman from Massachusetts. There were only 13 who would stand for the striking out of the appropriation for the physical valuation of the railroads.

Mr. BARTLETT. We were few in numbers, but a very select company. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRYAN. A very select and bright and shining company, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] is one of the most able, and I think perhaps the most able, of that entire company, being equaled in ability only by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

I wish also to call attention to the fact that when this Alaska bill was passed there was an amendment offered in the Senate providing for not less than \$10,000,000 or more than

\$20,000,000 for the building of ships to engage in ordinary merchant shipping, and not less than a dozen Senators—one Progressive, nine Republicans, and two Democrats—voted for that ship-purchase bill over there. That shows that there was no objection at that time on the part of these gentlemen to the idea of Government ownership or to the principle of Government ownership of the Alaska railroads and of ships; and when they object now to the principle of Government ownership as applied to ships or as applied to the Alaska railroad they are inconsistent and do not pursue the same course that they pursued when that bill was before them. The inexplicable inconsistency some display is beyond my power to understand. The people are going to want to know why such glaring inconsistencies exist.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I suggest to the gentleman that he does not mean, of course, to say that I voted for Government ownership of anything.

Mr. BRYAN. Oh, no; I said in the other House. While the gentleman is eminently qualified to represent his State in that other body, I referred to the action of the Senate and not to anything that took place here.

If this project had been a matter of private ownership and the building of the Alaska Railroad by a private corporation, undoubtedly by this time they would have issued \$100,000,000 of bonds for the water boys of Wall Street and \$100,000,000 of stock for the cash of the widows and orphans and another \$100,000,000 of stock for bonuses, and I do not doubt at all that the Yukon River would have been diverted from its course, and the water of the Yukon would have been turned into the stock issues of the Alaska Railway enterprise, after we had given to them all the land they wanted, and all the town sites and coal deposits they wanted, and all the other natural resources they would have demanded. I am glad this Congress has to go on record again for Government ownership of railroads. We are going to show to the world that the Government can build a railroad economically. We are going to show the railroad builders of this country a few tricks in the matter of the building of railroads in Alaska. We will show them that their pretended capitalization of \$60,000 a mile is an absolute farce, and that the Government can construct railroads much more cheaply than they have constructed the other lines in this country, and can keep out the water and can operate them cheaply, too. [Applause.]

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, it is well known that I opposed as vehemently as I could the bill for building the railroad in Alaska. I thought it was ill advised and bad policy, and I have not changed my mind since. I agree with what the gentleman from Illinois said, that the House is to a certain extent under obligation to pass this appropriation for \$2,000,000 as anyone in the bill.

Carried reading in the supplemental hearings the testimony of the Secretary of the Interior must see that the Secretary intends to recommend to the President the purchase of one of the existing railroads in Alaska. I believe he should be given the money to take advantage of the bargain, if there are any bargains in Alaska, to make a payment on an option in the next six months or a year in buying one of the railroads.

Still reserving my opposition to the whole proposition, I expect to vote for this \$2,000,000. The argument of the gentleman from Alaska presents us with the fact that the Matanuska coal fields have been found to have better coal than we hitherto supposed, and that this road will probably be projected through to the Matanuska coal field, and on the ground that it will hasten the day when in the winter we will have cheap coal and in the summer cheaper ice I expect to vote for the appropriation. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any doubt in the mind of anybody as to the situation touching the building of the Alaskan railroad. Certainly I have no desire to leave the committee under any false impression. I believe that it is very likely the President will see fit to buy one of the existing railroads in Alaska, and I think if the terms are proper he would be very foolish not to do so.

I do not believe that we could possibly justify the building of a parallel line to an existing railroad just for the sake of having the Government build the line. Now, if the line determined upon happens to be over a route that is already partially equipped with a railroad, common sense would indicate that we should buy the railroad already there, if it can be bought on reasonable terms.

With that situation confronting us, it would be manifestly unwise and improper not to provide the President with funds sufficient to take advantage of any proper offers that might be made.

We have determined the broad, basic question of policy. We have decided to build a railroad in Alaska, whether wisely or unwisely, that is behind us.

Now, there are some things that a legislative body can properly do and do better than can be done by any individual. Those things that properly belong to a legislative body are things relating to a policy. But when it comes to the execution of the policy, when it comes to the administration, then the very numbers of a legislative body disqualifies it from wisely determining what to do.

This Congress very wisely left to the President the carrying out of the policy which it had determined—the building of a railroad in Alaska. Now, when he comes to us and says conditions are such as to warrant an appropriation of this amount of money being made at this time, to say that unless we know the particular route and the exact amount of money to be expended we will not make the appropriation is to undertake to determine what this House can not determine, no matter what information is given it; the very size of the body prevents its giving a judgment of as much value as that of an administrative officer charged with the responsibility of seeing the work done.

Aside from this, we committed ourselves to this appropriation by providing that Congress should control the appropriations in lieu of a bond issue. For us to undertake to stop the work would be to exhibit bad faith, after the House, upon the assurance that was given, particularly by the Committee on Appropriations, when we voted in favor of the alternative plan of annual appropriations rather than a bond issue. I believe in carrying out the agreement, and I think it is up to the House to appropriate the money.

A good deal has been said about the condition of the Treasury. I recognize that we ought not to be as prodigal now as we might feel disposed at other times to be; but if the logic of the gentleman from Massachusetts was carried to its legitimate end, we would simply refuse to pass the sundry civil bill at all or we would cut out nine-tenths of the things in it, because of lack of any real necessity, which he says is a test. Most things which the Government does could be dispensed with and we would still live and get along; but you have to keep some proper perspective, and we are not in such a situation as to warrant us in stopping everything because it requires an appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired. All time has expired. The first question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma to perfect the text by striking out "\$2,000,000" and inserting "\$1,000,000."

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insane of Alaska: For care and custody of persons legally adjudged insane in Alaska, including transportation and other expenses, \$70,000.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. About five years ago the Committee on the Territories made a very thorough investigation of the subject of the insane in Alaska. At that time it was found that the conditions that obtained with regard to the insane there were not all that could be desired. As I recall, persons who were adjudged insane in Alaska at that time had to be confined in the jails for days and weeks, and even months, before transportation facilities could be had to bring them, I think to the State of Oregon, where they were cared for in some private institution by contract. Congress then authorized the construction of a building to care for the insane in Alaska, and I would like to ask the gentleman from New York what has been done with regard to improving the conditions there regarding the care of the insane, if anything?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, there has not been any complaint to the committee about the condition of the insane there. I think perhaps conditions have been improved somewhat.

Mr. GOOD. Was the building that was authorized ever constructed?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think not. My recollection is that it was not.

Mr. GOOD. Then we still bring the insane from Alaska down to some place in the States?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. And take care of them under contract?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They take care of them in an institution in Portland, the Morningside Asylum, under contract.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, the inquiry made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] relates to a bill that was

passed about four years ago for the erection of two detention hospitals in the Territory of Alaska—one to be erected at Fairbanks and another at Nome. Those detention hospitals were erected under a special appropriation from the Committee on Territories for the purpose of accommodating insane persons and detaining them locally pending their transportation to the hospital in Oregon, where they are permanently maintained under authority of the United States. Those detention hospitals have been built in Fairbanks and Nome. They are each large, commodious, and well adapted to the use for which they were constructed. They are under the care of the United States marshal, who is authorized to employ a guard, who receives \$200 a month for taking care of them, but there has never been an insane person detained in either of them yet.

I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD by attaching thereto a letter which I wrote recently to the Attorney General about this matter.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. When were the buildings completed?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. About 18 months ago, or nearly two years ago.

Mr. GOOD. Have they been accepted?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. Why is it they are not used for that purpose?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 6, 1915.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: By the act of June 21, 1910 (36 Stat. L., 852), authority was given and appropriation made for the erection of a detention hospital for the temporary care and detention of insane persons at Fairbanks, Alaska, and at Nome, Alaska; the sum of \$25,000 was appropriated, and after a long period of waiting the hospitals were finally completed. Both places are now finished and are in first-class shape for the purpose which Congress intended them in the act mentioned.

Your attention is also called to the report of the governor of Alaska to the Secretary of the Interior for 1914 and to page 29, where you will find this statement:

DETENTION HOSPITALS.

"The work of erecting and equipping detention hospitals for the temporary care of the insane at Nome and Fairbanks, which was begun in August, 1913, was completed during the year. These hospitals were authorized by act of Congress, approved June 25, 1910, but no appropriation has been made for their maintenance, and therefore they have not fulfilled the purpose for which they were intended. The detention hospital at Nome is particularly a necessity, as the remoteness of that place prevents the transportation of insane persons to Morningside Sanitarium at Portland, Oreg., after the close of navigation, or from about November 1 to June 15; hence the need of the hospital for such cases as may develop during the closed season of navigation. This condition applies in part to the detention hospital at Fairbanks, although patients are not infrequently transported during the winter season to Morningside Sanitarium, but they must be conveyed by stage a distance of 375 miles, and thence by rail and water routes to their destination, at a high cost."

While these two hospitals have been waiting occupancy for more than a year the poor, sick, and insane persons at Nome and Fairbanks are still confined in the dirty, foul-smelling, old jails at those places.

Herewith I inclose three photographs, made by Dr. Sutherland, who has charge of the health of insane and other persons in the jail at Fairbanks. These photographs show the exact condition of the room in the attic of the dirty wooden jail at Fairbanks in which insane women are kept when they are so unfortunate as to get into the clutches of the United States at that place. The garret seems to be cut into three rooms, a sitting room 10 feet 9 inches by 14 feet, where the height of the ceiling is less than 8 feet at the highest point, sloping with the roof to the floor. The sleeping room is 12½ feet wide by 14 feet long, with the same kind of a sloping roof, with one window and a door, and then there is a storeroom having no windows. The sleeping room opens off this storeroom only at one side, and the sitting room opens off on the other, and both the sleeping room and sitting room have an outlet to the jail below, down a little trapdoor, and there down a narrow stairway to the jail.

In this stinking hole the United States of America keeps the insane women who fall into their clutches at Fairbanks, Alaska. It is a disgrace to the Department of Justice that such a condition may continue to exist. Some innocent woman who becomes insane is arrested as if she were guilty of a crime and chucked into one of these dirty holes over this old, rotten, foul-smelling jail filled with the stench and curses of prisoners and kept there for months at a time. I am familiar with the situation, and myself have seen women sitting at the front window trying to get a little fresh air. It was after looking at places of this kind for 10 years that I introduced the bill for the building of the detention hospital at Fairbanks. No effort was made for years by those responsible for the care of these people to procure the building of this institution, although it was greatly needed. It was not until last year that the parties responsible for putting up the building were forced to do so, and now that it is constructed, more than a year has gone by and the Department of Justice has refused to permit those who are unfortunate enough to be insane to be confined in the detention hospital provided by the act of Congress. Gov. Strong calls attention to the situation, and says that the reason the insane persons are not confined at this detention hospital at Fairbanks is that no appropriation has been made for their maintenance and therefore they have not fulfilled the purpose for which they were intended.

Your attention is called to the fact that by the last clause of section 2 of the act of June 21, 1910, Congress provided that "the said hos-

pitals after their erection and equipment shall be under the charge and control of the United States marshal in the division where situated, and the maintenance thereof shall be paid in the manner and from the same fund as the expenses of United States jails under the same marshal is paid." While I was in Fairbanks this summer I discovered the hospital was not being utilized for the purpose for which it was erected, but that it was being occupied by a caretaker who was getting \$200 per month for watching it. I was also informed that it was used for raising chickens, and I have a photograph which I attach hereto, with an accompanying letter, which shows the chickens which have been slaughtered in the back yard, hanging by their heels to the front posts of this detention hospital.

The department authorizes the expenditure of \$200 a month for watching this building, and if that \$200 was utilized in addition to the amount which the department spends for the maintenance of this filthy attic in the dirty jail you would have money to maintain the hospital. Certainly conditions would be very much better under those circumstances than in the jail. Assuming that you take the bed out of the jail, as shown in these pictures, and put it in the new hospital, and assuming that you expend the same sum of money for employing the same officers at the new building that you do at the jail, and assuming that you add thereto the \$200 per month which you now pay a caretaker, and the amount you now expend for heat at the hospital would keep the hospital building warm enough to care for the insane in a better way than to confine them in violation of law and in violation of all humane ideas in the jail. It is a shame and a disgrace to the Department of Justice that such a condition is allowed to exist at Fairbanks, and I am sure that when your attention is called to it you will correct the evil.

I call your special attention to the statements made on the back of the three large photographs. The statements are made in the handwriting of Dr. J. A. Sutherland, who has charge of prisoners and insane persons in the jail. He says to you over his official signature that this foul-smelling hole in the garret is a veritable fire trap; that all the windows are heavily ironed, and the only means of egress from the upper story is by means of the staircase down a trapdoor into the jail. He also says that female prisoners and female insane persons are confined in these rooms; that the middle room in the attic contains the only bath in the jail, which is used by both men and women, and gives you the number and photographs of the window and doors. Certainly, the Department of Justice will not continue this vile arrangement when Congress has approved and designated a humane way of caring for the poor women whose only fault is that they are insane.

I have tried every way I could for years to get the United States marshal at Fairbanks to treat these insane women there with common decency and humanity, but it is impossible, and without the Department of Justice shall take this matter up and do what Congress has ordered to be done, they will continue to be kept in this hole, which is not only detrimental to their health and their sense of modesty but is a constant menace to their lives.

I respectfully request the Department of Justice to give this matter immediate consideration and that it give instruction to the United States marshal at Fairbanks to occupy the detention hospital for the purpose for which it is built, even if you have no more money than you now expend upon it. Will you please advise me of your action in this matter?

Before sending this letter I have shown it to Hon. MARTIN D. FOSTER, House of Representatives, who was largely responsible for the passage of the bill for the erection of these hospitals in Alaska.

Respectfully,

JAMES WICKERSHAM,
Delegate from Alaska.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I wish to add that poor, sick, and insane women are yet mistreated by confinement over the foul jail in Fairbanks, Alaska, by the Department of Justice.

The Clerk read as follows:

Yosemite National Park, Cal.: For protection and improvement, construction, and repair of bridges, fences, and trails, and improvement of roads other than toll roads, including not exceeding \$2,700 for maintenance and repair of horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles for use of the superintendent, supervisor, resident engineer, and employees in connection with general park work, \$75,000.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 110, line 17, after the word "work," change the comma to a semicolon and insert:

"The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept patented lands or rights of way, whether over patented or other lands in the Yosemite National Park, that may be donated for park purposes."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve the point of order.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will say that the amendment is subject to a point of order. I have taken it, however, verbatim from the provision that is contained in the following paragraph of the bill except the name of the park. This amendment would simply give to the Secretary of the Interior the power to accept gifts or donations of lands and roads to be used for park purposes. As I understand, in the Yosemite National Park there are about 1,000 acres of land owned by private persons, and yet that land is within the boundaries of the park. Such ownership would prevent a general scheme of improvement of the park by the Government. If any of those private owners desired to set up some kind of business or occupation that might be injurious to the operation of the park or conduct a business on private-owned land within park boundaries that would not be permitted on Government land, they could do it and the Government would be powerless to prevent it. I understand that public-spirited citizens are willing to contribute lands from time to time to this park. They ought to be permitted to do so.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, this land that is owned by private individuals is similar in character to the park land?

Mr. GOOD. Similar in character, as I understand it.

Mr. MANN. As I understood the gentleman's amendment, it simply provides that if those people are willing to give the land to the Government, the Government officials are authorized to take it free of charge?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; absolutely without any charge on the part of the Government whatsoever. It is the same provision that is contained in the next paragraph of the bill.

Mr. MANN. I can not see why there should be any objection to that as long as it is the same character of land and works in with the park land.

Mr. GOOD. It is within the boundaries of the national park and of the same general character, and if not acquired by gift some day the Government may want it badly enough to purchase it. The Secretary of the Interior should have permission to accept donations of this land, if such donations are made.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOWARD UNIVERSITY.

For maintenance, to be used in payment of part of the salaries of the officers, professors, teachers, and other regular employees of the university, ice and stationery, the balance of which shall be paid from donations and other sources, of which sum not less than \$1,500 shall be used for normal instruction, \$85,000.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. SISSON. The point of order is that this appropriation is not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, for 30 years Congress has been contributing to the support and maintenance of the Howard University. It is an institution incorporated by act of Congress to educate the colored people of the country. It has departments of law, medicine, and theology. Without the aid the Government gives it the institution can not continue. I have not been able to put my hand on the specific act which authorizes appropriations by Congress. Some other gentlemen may have been able to do so. I believe the appropriation should be made, and I think it would be very unfortunate if it is not made.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, with the permission of the Chair, without discussing the point of order, I would like to say a word or two, if the gentleman will reserve the point of order, upon the appropriation itself.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to reserving the point of order for a statement from the gentleman from Kentucky, but I would not want to prolong a discussion of the subject. I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to delay the committee with any lengthy speech, but I do desire to say a word or two in the hope of inducing the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] to withdraw his point of order. I am not prepared, Mr. Chairman, to say that as an original proposition I should have favored the establishment of the Howard University; neither am I prepared to say that I am in full accord with all of the methods of instruction there, or that I have as much belief in the results flowing from an attempt at the higher education of the negro as I should like to have. But I recognize that one of the greatest problems that has ever confronted a people is brought about by virtue of having a large number of people of a different and inferior race among a superior race, and that the problem can not be shirked by those of the superior race; and as a southern man, with the southern viewpoint upon the race problem, with considerable doubt as to the efficiency and the benefits that flow from much of the education offered the negro, I am not willing to close the door of hope in his face, and I am not yet willing to say that I believe that education for him is time and money wasted. I should peculiarly regret having this administration of my party in any way responsible for lessening the educational efforts which are now being made on behalf of the negro. Some of the work that the Howard University is doing is of unquestionable value, that particularly of the medical college. I believe that it is of tremendous importance to the negro, and of almost equal importance to the white man, that he should be made to realize the need for hygiene, for cleanliness of life, for the control of contagious diseases, and I think that any effort that serves to edu-

cate, even though it be in a limited way, negro men in medicine, with modern ideas of living, is of great value to the country and of almost equal value to the white people as it is to the negroes themselves.

Now, the Howard University is not a Government institution and does not depend entirely upon Government funds, but it is the only institution of its kind in this part of the country, and it does receive considerable benefit from the appropriations made by the Congress. For us now to deny these appropriations would be seriously to cripple that institution and would be to do a distinct harm, in my judgment, to the negro race. I do not believe that it would in any sense reflect the judgment of the white people of the South. I appreciate that the gentleman from Mississippi has a very proper view against appropriations by the Federal Government to institutions that are not governmental, and yet because of the peculiar circumstances surrounding this and because of the misunderstanding that it would lead to as to the true southern viewpoint touching the negro race, I hope he may find it possible not to make the point of order and to permit this appropriation that has been made for so many years in the past to be made.

I do not desire further to detain the committee, but I feel it would be unjust to myself and to the people whom I have the honor to represent if I did not reflect what I believe to be their viewpoint. The South is expending vast sums of money in undertaking to educate the negro, and while the results are not always what we would have them I do not believe there is any considerable body of men anywhere in the South who desire in any way to curtail this movement to help the negro forward to a broader, higher, better vision, and thereby make him a better citizen of the country. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. SISSON. Does the gentleman want—

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman is going to make the point of order, I hope he will reserve it; I would like to make a few remarks.

Mr. SISSON. How much time does the gentleman desire, two or three minutes?

Mr. MONDELL. Well, four or five minutes.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I withhold the point of order for five minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Mississippi will consent to withdraw the point of order. I desire to remind him that my understanding is that it was a Democratic Congress 35 years ago that made the first appropriation for the Howard University, and we have been appropriating regularly for that institution for the education of the colored youth ever since that time, both Republican Congresses and Democratic Congresses. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] has well said this is an institution doing a splendid work. It is doing work for a people to whom we, as a people, owe a great deal. The institution can not live without this Government aid, as the gentleman from Mississippi knows. My recollection is that its income, outside of the appropriation made by Congress, is less than 60 per cent of the amount appropriated. This school is the only school of its kind for the colored youth in the United States. Its standing largely rests upon the fact that it is a Government institution or at least an institution largely supported by the Federal Government. It is very economically administered, as all members of the Committee on Appropriations who have studied these items know. It is doing a splendid work with comparatively a small outlay, and I do not think the gentleman from Mississippi wants to put himself in the position, or his party in the position, of declining to continue these appropriations we have been making for so many years, and can not believe he wants to desert the good work of helping the colored people of the country secure a higher and broader education and encouraging them to do their very best in the world.

Mr. GILLETT. Will the gentleman allow me a couple of minutes?

Mr. SISSON. I will reserve the point of order for a few minutes.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that I also hope the gentleman will not make his point of order, because if this were an isolated instance, if there were not constant cases in this bill and in other bills exactly parallel to this, I should not criticize the gentleman. But to pick out this one line of appropriation and make a point of order against that will, it seems to me, be taken as indicating a disposition and a temper toward the negro race of which there have been manifestations already in this administration which have excited much adverse comment in the country, which have not tended to harmonize the different sections, and which, it seems to me, the gentleman would not wish to increase.

Now, as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] has said, the South is doing much for the negro. The North is doing much also. I myself, as executor of an estate, in the last few years transferred to an institution in the South in one sum over \$300,000 which a client had left to it for the education of the negro—the savings of a pure, self-sacrificing, self-denying, simple life, and it seems to me that when that philanthropy is being shown both in the North and in the South, and when we are appropriating both in this bill and in other bills for a great many other purposes which are not authorized in law, it would be a singular and ungracious act on the part of the gentleman to pick out this one object, for which we have appropriated for many years, and make a point of order against it. Of course the gentleman has the power to strike out this claim by his point of order, but I trust he will not exercise it. When private philanthropy is doing so much the Government might continue its usual practice.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like the Chair to indulge me for just a moment. I want to say that in my State we make provision for the education of the negro, and I presume, in proportion to the amount of taxes collected from the two races, respectively, the whites pay a larger percentage for the education of the negro than any other State in the Union. We provide identically the same schools, agricultural and otherwise, for the negro that we do for the white people.

I want to assure the gentlemen of the committee that my reason for making this point of order is because I do not believe that this appropriation ought to be made, even if it were a white school. I think the Government should not appropriate any money to private or sectarian institutions. We are making appropriations in all the States of the Union for the higher education of everybody. Another reason why this appropriation should not be made is that theology is taught. I do not believe that the Federal Government or any State should spend one single penny in support of any school of theology of any kind or character.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow me a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield to the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Has not the theological department been abolished and the theological school sold?

Mr. SISSON. It has not been abolished.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I understood it so. We passed a law the other day for the purpose of allowing them to sell their theological school.

Mr. SISSON. That is a different proposition. That was to enable them to sell another piece of land. The whole thing is consolidated.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not think Federal money ought to be appropriated for this institution, and without detaining the committee longer I make a point of order on the item.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] makes a point of order against the appropriation in the bill for Howard University, on the ground that it is not authorized by law. Clause 2, Rule XXI, provides that—

No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law—

And so forth.

The Chair called upon the chairman of the committee, Mr. FITZGERALD, to cite any authority of law for this appropriation, and he failed to do so. Section 3597 of Hinds' Precedents provides—and that is a ruling by this House—that "those upholding items in an appropriation bill should have the burden of showing the law authorizing it." That is the unbroken precedent of this House.

Now, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] stated that this appropriation had been made from year to year. That is true. But under the rulings of the House the fact that an appropriation has been made from year to year, if unauthorized by law, does not make it in order. I cite section 3588 of Hinds' Precedents, which reads as follows:

An appropriation for an object in an annual appropriation bill makes law only for that year, and does not become "existing law" to justify a continuation of the appropriation.

Following the rulings above cited and on account of the fact that there is no authority of law cited to authorize this appropriation, the Chair sustains the point of order, and the item is stricken from the bill. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For tools, materials, fuel, wages of instructors, and other necessary expenses of the department of manual arts, \$12,000.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that. The CHAIRMAN. For the same reasons the Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For books, shelving, furniture, and fixtures for the libraries, \$1,500.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that. The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order for the same reasons. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For improvement of grounds and repairs of buildings, to be immediately available, \$10,000.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that. The CHAIRMAN. For the same reasons the Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Medical department: For part cost of needed equipment, laboratory supplies, apparatus, and repair of laboratories and buildings, \$7,000.

Mr. SISSON. I make the point of order on that, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. For the same reasons the Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For material and apparatus for chemical, physical, and natural-history studies and use in laboratories of the new science hall, including cases and shelving, \$2,000.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that. Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, this building was constructed by the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This building and the apparatus in it were provided for out of an appropriation made by Congress.

Mr. SISSON. This is not for an addition to the building. This is for chemical apparatus and materials.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear from the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This building is called "Science Hall." It was constructed out of an appropriation made by Congress. Now, "Science Hall" is a hall in which there are chemical, physical, and natural-history laboratories, and this appropriation is for materials for use in the laboratories which belong to such a building, together with cases and shelving in such a building. The building was paid for by Government appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman permit the Chair to ask him a question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the Government any interest in this building, or in any of the buildings of the Howard University?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I guess the building belongs to the University. I think it does. We appropriated the money for the new "Science Hall" for the building.

The CHAIRMAN. Unless the gentleman from New York can cite a statute authorizing the appropriation the Chair, for the reasons given in the ruling on the first point of order, will sustain the point of order. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For fuel and light: For part payment for fuel and light, Freedmen's Hospital and Howard University, including necessary labor to care for and operate the same, \$3,500.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that. The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, \$101,000.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the same point of order. The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Enforcement of antitrust laws: For the enforcement of antitrust laws, including not exceeding \$15,000 for salaries of necessary employees at the seat of government, \$300,000: *Provided, however*, That no part of this money shall be spent in the prosecution of any organization or individual for entering into any combination or agreement having in view the increasing of wages, shortening of hours, or bettering the conditions of labor, or for any act done in furtherance thereof, not in itself unlawful: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the prosecution of producers of farm products and associations of farmers who cooperate and organize in an effort to and for the purpose to obtain and maintain a fair and reasonable price for their products.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I call attention to the paragraph which has just been read for the purpose of saying that if any gentleman wishes to move to strike it out I hope he will do so now and not complain of lack of opportunity hereafter.

I withdraw the pro forma motion.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I should have moved to strike out the item that the gentleman refers to as a sort of tribute to Democratic legislation, except that I think we ought to let the Clerk read the bill for a little while without much discussion and see if we can not make some progress on the bill. I am sure if the motion to strike out this paragraph should be made we would waste a good deal of time in discussing it and would not accomplish anything if we struck it out. Whether it is in or out does not make any difference, except that, being in the bill, it reflects upon Democrats being successful in passing the Clayton bill. I hope that remark will not provoke discussion.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Let the Clerk read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, National Training School for Boys, \$49,276.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CRISP reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had had under consideration the sundry civil bill (H. R. 21318) and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks on the subject of the great emancipator's speech at Gettysburg.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the subject of the great emancipator's speech at Gettysburg. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALCONER. Mr. Speaker, in the early hours of to-day's session the Members of the House had the privilege of listening to two very eloquent and touching speeches on Abraham Lincoln. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a speech delivered before a joint session of the Legislature of the State of Washington one year ago to-day by the Hon. Will H. Thompson, of Seattle, on the subject of Abraham Lincoln, and also to place in the RECORD some extracts from a speech of Dr. L. L. West, of Everett, State of Washington.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech made before the joint session of the Washington Legislature one year ago to-day by Will H. Thompson, and also some excerpts from a speech made by Dr. West, of Everett, Wash. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I think I shall not object, although I do not want anybody throughout the country who is an orator to think that thereby he can make a speech before some home club on the subject of Lincoln and get it inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because there are too many gentlemen engaged in that thing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I object.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 7555. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Suwanee River, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 16896. An act for the relief of Col. Richard H. Wilson, United States Army;

H. R. 9584. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States to sell the present old post office and the site thereof in the city of Jersey City, N. J.; and

H. R. 18783. An act to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office building and site at St. Petersburg, Fla.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Saturday, February 13, 1915, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a detailed statement of the refunds of customs duties, etc., for the

fiscal year ended June 30, 1914, as required by Paragraph Y of section 3 of the tariff act of October 3, 1913 (H. Doc. No. 1591); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

2. Letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of harbor at Saxis, Va. (H. Doc. No. 1592); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

3. Letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of Alsea Bay and Bar, Ore. (H. Doc. No. 1593); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SUMNERS, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21074) increasing the limit of cost of the United States post-office building at Excelsior Springs, Mo., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1399), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 21392) for the relief of James F. Smith, and the same was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 21423) concerning publications in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 21436) to provide for summer-residence homesteads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington urging exploration of coal and oil resources in that State; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BELL of California: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California urging and favoring the passage of the Keating bill, to place on the regular pension roll war veterans who served in the Indian campaign between the years 1865 and 1891; to the Committee on Pensions.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY: A bill (H. R. 21424) granting a pension to Arah Ann Bussard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BELL of California: A bill (H. R. 21425) granting a pension to Sarah M. Skinner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21426) granting an increase of pension to James W. Warfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 21427) granting an increase of pension to Michael Kouth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 21428) granting a pension to Mary J. Gallager; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 21429) granting a pension to Nancy V. Norman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21430) granting an increase of pension to John J. Lee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORRISON: A bill (H. R. 21431) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Jacobs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 21432) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Holley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: A bill (H. R. 21433) for the relief of the heirs of Isaac Hudson; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TAVENNER: A bill (H. R. 21434) granting a pension to Martha Stoneburg; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21435) granting an increase of pension to William H. Stephenson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 21437) granting a pension to Lucilla E. McDowell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GALLAGHER: A bill (H. R. 21438) for the relief of John Marks; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 21439) granting a pension to Mariah Wilson Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland: A resolution (H. Res. 731) for the relief of the heir of Robert H. Key, late an employee of the House; to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of citizens of Tiffin, Ohio, favoring embargo on munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of citizens of Dayton, Ohio, favoring an embargo on munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of members of the American Neutrality League, favoring an embargo on munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN: Petition of sundry residents of Germantown and Wheelersburg, Ohio, against legislation abridging freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of John A. Herbert, J. G. Chadwick, and other citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, and Hamilton County, Ohio, favoring an embargo on munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY: petition of Walter Kolakowski and others of Johnstown, Pa., relative to unemployment in the United States; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois: Petition of 420 citizens of Chicago, Ill., favoring House joint resolution 377, forbidding export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Resolutions adopted by St. Boniface Society, of Sheboygan, Wis., with a membership of 130, asking for the passage of a resolution at this session to levy an embargo on all contraband of war, save foodstuffs only; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring House joint resolution 377, forbidding export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., against increased armament in the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COPLEY: Memorial of John V. Hagemann, of Elgin, Ill., favoring construction of public works that work may be given to the unemployed in this country; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CURRY: Petitions by citizens and residents of California, favoring the passage of the so-called Hamill bill for the retirement of old and disabled civil-service employees of the United States; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petitions by citizens and residents of California, favoring 1-cent letter postage for letter mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions by citizens and residents of California, favoring House joint resolution 377, forbidding export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of the United States, favoring House bill 5892, providing pensions for Civil War military telegraphers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions and petitions of citizens and residents of the State of California, protesting against the proposed change in the design of the flag of our country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions by citizens and residents of California, opposing the passage of House bill 13305, the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions by citizens and residents of California, favoring the passage of House bill 13305, the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition by Local No. 137, United Garment Workers of America, favoring Senate bill 2321, relative to sale of convict-made goods; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions by citizens and residents of the State of California, favoring the immediate passage of the Palmer-Owen child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petitions by citizens and residents of California, favoring a 1-cent postage rate for first-class mail matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions by citizens and residents of California, favoring the pensioning of the veterans of certain of our Indian wars; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, resolution by the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, favoring House joint resolution 344, authorizing appointment of a national marketing commission; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of I. Joseph Delahanty and other citizens of Wayne, Ill., favoring a law providing that when a citizen of one State is acquitted of any and all charge of crime in another State that he be returned or allowed to return to his own State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE: Petition of citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring House joint resolution 377, forbidding export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Petitions of F. Fibeger and 24 other citizens of La Crosse, Wis., and also citizens of Chicago, Ill., favoring House joint resolution 377, forbidding export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FINLEY: Petition of citizens of College Place, State of Washington, against any abridgement of freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petitions of Zion Lutheran Church of Brooklyn, N. Y., and citizens of Mankato, N. Y., favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Fulton Street Board of Trade, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring Hamill civil-service-retirement bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of Merchants' Association of New York against H. R. 18666, the Government ship-purchase bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of 100 citizens of Illinois, petitioning Congress to pass a law in accordance with the Constitution that when a citizen of one State is acquitted of any and all charge of crime in another State that he be returned or allowed to return to his own State, as Harry K. Thaw should be allowed to return to his home in Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of M. Stoney, Boston, Mass., against increased armament for the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GILMORE: Petition of citizens of Boston, Mass., favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Emery T. Morris, chairman, William Monroe Trotter, secretary, and other members of the executive committee, Massachusetts Branch of the National Independent Equal Rights League, against Jim Crow laws in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GOEKE: Petition of W. A. Kelmast and other citizens of Defiance, Ohio, favoring House joint resolution 377, placing embargo on export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAY: Petition of Dr. W. M. Wampler, of Richmond, Ind., protesting against law regulating sale of narcotics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREGG: Petition of R. Jaenecke and other citizens of Galveston, Tex., against export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of the German-Austro-Hungarian Relief Fund Society, of Utah, favoring the speedy enactment of Senate bill 6688, forbidding export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS of Maryland: Petition signed by a number of citizens of Hutton, Garrett County, Md., protesting against the sale and shipping of arms and munitions of war to the warring nations of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LIEB: Petition by Right Rev. A. Schmidt, Very Rev. Luke Gruwe, Rev. Celestine Sander, Rev. Anselm Schaaf, Rev. Louis Fuchs, Rev. Benno Gerber, S. Gregory Bechtold, Rev. Edward Berheide, Rev. Albert Kleber, Henry Brenner, Rev. Thomas Schaefers, Michael F. Schnurr, Rev. Robert Glasmeyer, Joseph Ernest, Rev. Aemiliam Elpers, Rev. Richard Mattingly, Brother Innocent Benkert, Benedict J. Piers, Jacob Meier, Antony Manhard, Rev. Charles Dudine, Rev. Columban Thuis, Lawrence Riebethaler, Cyril Gaul, Justin Snyder, Ildephouse Kreidler, Sylvester Eiseman, Norbert Spitzmesser Lambert Enslinger, Bruno Luchsland, Ignatius Esser, Jerome Oligschlager, Thomas Kempf, Louis Hoffman, Otto J. Depeau, Charles Wassmer, Rev. Everard Olinger, Urban Spruik, Frank McCarthy, Ephrem Laurrell, John Apke, Odislo Stocker, Wendelin Rust, Boniface Berkert, Henry St. Michael, Fidelir Berkert, Karl Muller, Joseph Huber, Henry Phillip, Frank Strosyke, Stanislaus Kemper, Augustine Haberkorn, Rev. Benedict Brown, Rev. John

Schenk, Dan Walsh, jr., Pierre A. Bisse, M. M. Faber, Dennis O. Begley, John M. Dudine, Joseph Klug, Jacob Nickels, Vin Ciacchio, Omer Eiseman, Alois Capnath, J. J. Masnoth, George Hasser, C. Bosler, Rev. Andrew Bastnagle, Henry Dugan, Roy Meller, V. Sullivan, E. J. Ritter, G. Sebastian, M. L. McManus, William Ruckar, George Zenner, Elmer J. Ritter, N. C. Hummer, Fred C. Rothermel, John Dapp, Joseph Kempf, Alphonse Verth, Nicolous Frei, Cammillus Hoepf, Meinrad Rinderknecht, Rev. Dominic Barthel, Edward L. Eiseman, Edward Bockhold, Urban Sonderman, John H. Vagedos, Irvin Mattingly, John L. Goetz, Sims C. H. Fricher, Albert T. Rumbach, Jacob O. Goetz, V. H. Rancilio, Henry Trapp, John A. Walde, Henry Ebuert, Lloyd Burcham, Joseph O'Donnell, Joseph Fromme, Herman Koorsen, Joseph L. Quick, Aloysius Langel, George A. Behrmann, William Knapp, Harry Becker, W. E. Mulroney, Elmer Young, Louis Beecher, Joseph Collenbeck, Rev. Clement Zepf, Rev. George Schenk, John Connoly, August Ruehl, Bernard Gerlinski, J. M. Rouck, Charles Girardot, Joseph A. Snitzer, L. S. Moerygamba, Otto A. Peters, Carl Niebertholer, Jolly R. Hayden, Henry Pieper, Joseph Underburg, Clifford J. Reed, A. J. Thompson, Edward A. Dean, John Kraemer, James J. Maloney, Pierce E. Dixon, George Pauluskas, W. F. Bastnagle, Leo Moerygamba, John A. Raguckas, John J. Vincins, Bernard B. Sheridan, E. C. Peggs, Edgar O'Connor, Clarence Martin, Thomas McGrath, Simon Treller, John J. Doyle, Leonard Wernsing, Julius Schoen, Joseph Tribble, Rowan Jochum, Andrew O'Keefe, Raymond Hasbough, F. Freeman, Harry A. Reed, John Lenzini, William Wiggman, L. A. Lindeman, John Johst, John Preske, Anthony Kunkel, Walter Turskis, Clemens Hunger, William Lensing, John H. Freeman, John C. Maloney, Franz Hodepp, Albert Esser, Frank Hillen, Anthony Heimann, August Fussenegger, G. Henninger, John J. Vincins, W. A. Bastnagle, Henry Peiper, Jolly R. Hayden, F. J. Timoney, Francis Mellen, John J. Geran, A. M. Princis, Leo F. Creden, John F. McBarron, Carl A. Busold, Lawrence Durkin, Raymond Donovan, M. Herold, Joseph Schaefer, Raber Thies, Raber Bloenke, Frank Laemme, Barrett Tieman, Martin Heiner, Carl Halsinger, Frank Claycomb, Mathew Winzapple, John Mentaugh, Thomas Hoffman, Raymond Schmidt, Francis A. Hanley, Frank Harpring, Joseph Anthony Duffy, Francis Dickhoff, Jerome Bfau, H. Wirtsschalter, Henry Doll, R. D. White, Bernard Loepker, Fred Weber, John J. Flynn, William Moore, J. J. Fitzgibbon, Frederick Rothermel, Charles Walsh, Rev. Richard Mattingly, Innocent Benkert, Benedict J. Piers, Jacob Meier, Anthony Mannheart, Rev. Charles Dudine, Rev. Columban Thuis, Lawrence Rieenthaler, Cyril Gaul, Justin Snyder, Ildephouse Kreidler, Ignatus Esser, Lambert Enslinger, Sylvester Eiseman, Norbert Spitzmesser, Jerome Ohligschlager, Thomas Kempf, Bruno Luchland, Louis Hoffman, Otto J. DeJean, Charles Wassmer, Rev. Everard Olinger, Urban Spouik, Frank McCarthy, Ephrem Laurell, John Apke, Odilo Stooker, Boniface Benkert, Wendelin Rust, Henry M. Nibel, Karl Muller, Fidelis Benkert, Joseph Huber, Henry Philipps, Friedrich Deok, Stanislaus Kemper, Frank Strosyk, A. Haberkorn, Rev. B. Brown, Niclaus Frei, A. Verth, C. Hoepf, M. Benderknecht, Rev. D. Bethel, Edward L. Eisman, Urban Sonderman, J. L. Goetz, J. H. Vagedes, E. Bockhold, Irvin Mattingly, L. C. H. Fricker, A. T. Rumbach, J. Goetz, V. A. Rancilio, Henry Trapp, J. A. Walde, Henry Ebuert, Lloyd Burcham, Bernard Loepker, J. O'Donnell, Joseph Fromme, Leonard Wernsing, Herman Koorsen, Joseph L. Quick, A. Langel, G. A. Behrmann, W. Knapp, H. Becker, W. E. Mulroney, E. C. Peggs, Edgar O'Connor, Clarence Martin, Thomas McGrath, S. Teller, J. J. Doyle, Julius Schoen, J. Tribble, R. Jochum, Andrew O'Keefe, R. Hasbough, F. Freeman, H. A. Reed, J. Linzini, W. Wigman, L. A. Lindermann, John Jabst, John Preske, Anthony Kunkel, Walter Terskey, Clemens Hunger, W. Lensing, J. C. Maloney, Franz Hodepp, Albert Esser, M. Herold, Joseph Schaefer, Frank Laemme, Raber Thuis, S. Bloemke, Barrett Tieman, M. Geinero, Carl Holsinger, Frank Claycomb, Mathew Winzapple, J. Murtaugh, Thomas Hoffman, Raymond Schmidt, Francis A. Hanley, Frank Harpring, Joseph Anthony, Francis Deckhoff, Henry Doll, H. Winterhalter, R. D. Hite, Denis O. Begley, M. L. Faber, Jacob Nickels, Ed. Menke, J. J. Massoth, Roy Mellen, George Hasser, William Racher, jr., Victor Sullivan, George Sebastian, George Zeimer, Fred Weber, Thomas Sodye, Frank Smith, Elmer Young, Louis Becker, Rev. George Schenk, A. Rhihi, Col. Riebuffaler, Charles Walsh, E. J. Ritter, J. M. Rouck, Joseph A. Snitzer, Joseph Underberg, A. J. Thompson, E. A. Dean, Frank Hillen, Francis Mellen, Leo F. Creden, C. A. Busald, J. F. McBarron, all of St. Meinrad, Ind., urging the adoption of House joint resolutions 377 and 378, Senate bill 6688, and House bill 19548, to prohibit the sale and export of arms, ammunition, and munitions of war to any of the friendly nations at present at war in Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Harlan Merrick, V. V. Field, E. C. Ediston, M. T. Spurling, Albert Servant, Andrew Blair, Dock Walker, Louis Laib, jr., Louis Laib, Jesse E. Boren, L. C. Giesleman, Bruce Cox, William Witherow, W. B. Gieselman, Clark Read, John Deweese, David Sprowl, Marshall Sprowl, C. E. McMillan, Charles Stub, D. I. Haley, William Carpenter, R. A. Cushman, J. A. Brumfield, W. C. Boren, C. E. Stormont, C. H. Billingsly, J. H. Laib, all of Princeton, Ind., protesting against House bill 20644, to exclude certain publications from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of M. M. Fitzwilliam, Margaret Hartwick, J. W. Worstmann, H. V. Williams, Walter E. Foley, all of Evansville, Ind., favoring House bill 5139, the Hamill civil-service retirement bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petitions of Louis Fuchs and George W. Bauer, of Evansville, Ind., favoring House joint resolution 377, forbidding export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of the Ramblers' Literary Club, by Lena Highman, of Mount Vernon, Ind., and the Woman's Franchise League, of Newburg, Ind., by Dr. Phelph, Lillie Knapp, Dora Abshur, Virginia Fuguay, Mrs. S. A. Brentano, Mrs. T. P. Parsons, Miss Lena Frank, Mrs. H. E. Durgin, Mrs. J. W. Fuguay, Mrs. Charles Minnis, Mrs. Martha Williams, Mrs. William Warren, and Mrs. A. J. Rutledge, all of Newburg, Ind., favoring the Palmer-Owen child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. LLOYD: Petition of citizens of Clark and Lewis Counties, Mo., favoring House bill 20644, to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of 113 citizens of Clark County, Mo., favoring House bill 20644, to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LOBECK: Petition of Socialist Party of Nebraska, favoring embargo on wheat; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Communication of Alois Schreiner, president Admiral Schley Lodge, No. 32, New Britain, Conn., in re House joint resolutions 377 and 378, Senate bill 6688, and House bill 19548; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of citizens of Syracuse and Burnett, Nebr., favoring embargo on export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of Antonio Gizinskowikz, Providence, R. I., relative to unemployment in the United States; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Rev. H. N. Lawrence, Providence, R. I., favoring Hamill civil-service retirement bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of E. F. McKenna, Providence, R. I., relative to persecution of Roman Catholic clergy in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Board of Hospital Commissioners, Providence, R. I., favoring a bill to establish a national leprosarium; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of Manhattan Wholesale Grocery Co., Providence, R. I., favoring continued manufacture by the United States Government of stamped envelopes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. PALMER: Petition of citizens of Easton, Pa., favoring House joint resolution 377, forbidding export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Philadelphi (Pa.) District, Council of Textile Workers, asking for congressional investigation of Philadelphia Arsenal works at Frankford, Pa.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIMS: Petition of Woman's Missionary Society, Paris, Tenn., favoring amendment to the Constitution forbidding polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: Petition of the National Association of Vicksburg Veterans, favoring Collier bill (H. R. 19375); to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. VOLLMER: Petitions of 1,050 American citizens, for the adoption of House joint resolution 377, to prohibit the export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of the Clinton Commercial Club, of Clinton, Iowa, urging immediate legislation for flood protection and reclamation of lands in Mississippi Basin; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petitions of 2,529 American citizens, for the adoption of House joint resolution 377, to prohibit the export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of 1,175 American citizens, for the adoption of House joint resolution 377, to prohibit the export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.